

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, November 2, 1993**

1:30 p.m.

Date: 93/11/02

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Dear God, author of all wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, we ask Thy guidance in order that truth and justice may prevail in all our judgments.

Amen.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

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

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two petitions to table before the Legislature today. The first petition is signed by 458 parents and teachers mostly from the city of Calgary expressing concerns about proposed education cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, the second petition that I have to present today is on the same general issue, a total of 55 signatures expressing concerns in particular about ECS, early childhood services, and special needs children.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present today. It's a petition that was prepared by a constituent in my riding of Edmonton-McClung. In fact, it takes the form of a very passionate poem raising constituent Ms Wood's concerns about the manner in which social services and the allowances surrounding social services have been cut so dramatically and have hurt so many people so severely.

head: **Reading and Receiving Petitions**

MR. HENRY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request that the petition I filed yesterday, signed by over a thousand Albertans, be now read.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

We the undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to urge the government to halt plans for the cuts to the special needs program in our education system.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would request that the petition that I presented yesterday on behalf of constituents regarding the upgrading of range road 223 now be read.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

We the undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to urge the government to halt plans for the proposed upgrading of range road 223 and to make better use of the money in these times of economic restraint.

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

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the second petition that I presented on Wednesday last now be read and received.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

To: The Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in Legislature assembled
The petition of the undersigned to oppose the round-up, auction or slaughter of all wild horses in Alberta, humbly urges the Legislative Assembly to ask the Government:

1. That there be a complete moratorium on all proposed round-ups, auctions and slaughter of wild horses;
2. That environmental studies be conducted to determine what effect the wild horses are having upon the wildlife and the environment and that should this research show conclusively that the wild horses are having a negative impact, alternative non-lethal measures such as immunocontraception should be implemented to decrease the birth rate;
3. That a long-term management plan for Alberta's public lands should be drawn up that recognizes the rights of wild horses as an integral part of the ecosystem;
4. That legal protection for wild horses be provided throughout Alberta; and further
5. That the ancestors of these wild horses have made an immeasurable contribution to our heritage in faithful service to our explorers, cowboys, settlers and native people. Saving Alberta's wild horses is saving a slice of Alberta's history.

head: **Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Standing Committee on Private Bills has had certain Bills under consideration and wishes to report as follows. The committee recommends that the following Bills proceed: Bill Pr. 5, Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1993, and Bill Pr. 6, Mennonite Mutual Insurance Co. (Alberta) Ltd. Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, the committee recommends that the following Bills proceed with some amendments: Bill Pr. 2, The Youth Emergency Services Foundation Amendment Act, 1993, and Bill Pr. 17, Canadian Health Assurance Corporation Act.

Mr. Speaker, the committee recommends that the following Bills not proceed: Bill Pr. 3, Mosaic College of Canada Act, and Pr. 15, Alberta Seniors' Legislature Act.

Mr. Speaker, I request the concurrence of the Assembly in these recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in this report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I am serving notice that tomorrow under Written Questions I will be moving that the written questions do stand and retain their places and under Motions for Returns that Motion 222 be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to give notice that immediately upon calling Orders of the Day I would like to seek unanimous consent of the Assembly for the following motion:

Be it resolved that the Assembly waive Standing Order 8(2)(a) in order to now give consideration to second reading of Bills Pr. 2, Pr. 5, Pr. 6, and Pr. 17.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. ROSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On speaking to Motion for a Return 197, I undertook to file with the House a number of

reports, economic studies, and federal studies related to child support. I'd like to file those now.

I'd also like to table the 30th annual report of the Alberta Racing Commission to March 31, 1993.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm please to table a response to Motion for a Return 213, which is "copies of the latest actuarial valuation report prepared by or for the . . . (WCB) containing the assumptions which have resulted in a significant reduction in the accumulated deficit of the WCB."

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

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure as the chair of the Council on Professions and Occupations, for which I'm paid a small monthly stipend, to file the following annual reports: the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta, the Society of Management Accountants of Alberta, the Certified General Accountants' Association of Alberta, the Alberta Dental Assistants Association, the Alberta Registered Professional Foresters Association, and finally the Alberta Association of Registered Occupational Therapists.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposition House Leader.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table over 100 letters to the Minister of Education from parents who have children attending Our Lady of the Prairies school in my riding. These letters ask that the minister reconsider whether cutbacks to education are advisable and urge him to not in any way, shape, or form contemplate the amalgamation of Catholic separate schools with the public school system.

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

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table four copies of the outcome of a miniroundtable on the proposed education cuts. These roundtables took place in my constituency by my constituents over the past couple of months.

head: **Introduction of Guests**

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

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour and privilege to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly a group of 40 parents who are here today. They met with members of the Liberal caucus. I understand they're meeting with the Minister of Education a little later on. There are 40 that are in the Legislature today, and these are parents with concerns about ECS, early childhood services, and children with special needs. These parents come from a total of 16 different Calgary constituencies and six other constituencies outside of the city of Calgary, so it's a broad range of individuals from a broad geographic area. The trip was organized by Ms Tresa Petersen-Wright. They are in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and be greeted by the Legislative Assembly.

1:40

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

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a privilege and an honour to present to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly 73 students from one of St. Albert's finest

schools, Sir Alexander Mackenzie. They are here with their teachers Mr. Roger Bouthillier, Mrs. Anne-Marie Stacey, Ms Cheryl Hughes, Miss Gayle Woytowich and parent helpers Mrs. Laurie Upright and Mrs. Shelley Klesko. They are in the public and members' galleries. I'd ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

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

MR. WHITE: I truly thank you, sir. I rise today to introduce to you and through you 21 guests that are here from Calder elementary school. They are grade 6 students, and they're here with Leona Martin, their teacher. They're in the members' gallery. I'd ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this House.

Thank you.

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

MR. MITCHELL: You have to know, Mr. Speaker, that the longer you don't recognize me, the more the suggestions for reasons why that's occurring. It's not because I'm short, because of course I'm not.

I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members of the Legislature Barb Wood. She is here today in support of her petition, which I presented moments ago in this session. I'd like to suggest to the Legislature that she should be commended for her effort to influence this policy which she has rightly and properly I think criticized and is critical of. I would ask that she rise in the Legislature and receive the welcome of the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Career Development.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly two important elected student leaders from the University of Alberta who are seated in the members' gallery this afternoon to watch today's proceedings: Mr. Terence Filewych, president of the University of Alberta students' union, and Ms Karen Wichuk, vice-president external of the University of Alberta students' union. I'd ask them to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly this afternoon.

head: **Oral Question Period**
Education Funding

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, before the Premier left for China, the Premier said that he wouldn't even blink on education cuts. The Deputy Premier said today that cuts to education will be 20 percent or even more. The Education minister persists in his intention to cut \$569 million in education, which is actually 31 percent. Yesterday the Treasurer completely confused Albertans when he said that 20 percent was only a target. My first question is to the Minister of Education. If 20 percent isn't the real target, the real cut, will the minister tell Albertans what the real cut is so that they don't have to worry about this whole business?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the government is firm in its resolve and its commitment to balance the provincial budget. The government is firm in its commitment to reduce expenditure by 20 percent. The \$369 million is accurate information in terms of that being 20 percent of Education's operating budget. That is information that was provided as a firm target for discussion in the

roundtables that we are holding. We are going to listen to peoples' responses, and we are going to make decisions leading up to our grant announcements and to the setting of the spring budget.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, since the Treasurer is saying one thing and the Minister of Education is saying another thing, will the Minister of Education explain to Albertans who the real Minister of Education now is?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, it would seem from these remarks that the hon. leader does not want us to consult with Albertans. He does not want us to listen to what they have to say with respect to their priorities. We are committed to doing that and making our decisions accordingly.

MR. DECORE: Blink, blink.

Mr. Speaker, since the Premier is taking a position on one side, as is the Deputy Premier, as is the Minister of Education, and the Treasurer is taking quite a different position, will the Deputy Premier tell Albertans who's in control over there?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is in control.

MR. DECORE: The Premier just blinked in China somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, last night 4,000 people attended a meeting in Edmonton to protest the government's planned cuts to education. To his credit at least the Minister of Education appeared and spoke to the crowd. The minister was able to see people, hear people, and really get a pretty good feeling of how 4,000 people felt. My question to the minister is this: does the minister still believe that people protesting the cuts have been brainwashed by agitators?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd just like to indicate for the edification of the hon. leader that I am meeting with many people across this province. I have been to many meetings listening to views about the future of education and future priorities for it. Also, I was very impressed by the meeting last night. It was good to see so many of my former colleagues, members of the Alberta Teachers' Association there. There was a large student representation, and certainly there were views to be expressed there. I listened carefully to what was presented. I think these types of local meetings, as I've said several times in this Legislature, are important, as are the meetings being held all across the province and the various good ideas and recommendations that are coming forward.

MR. DECORE: Agitators was the question, but so what.

Well, 12,000 people have attended their own organized meetings, Mr. Minister. Isn't it now time for a whole new round of public meetings so that Albertans can really give you their responses to your intentions?

MR. JONSON: We have had extensive consultation, and at the risk of being called out of order, I would like to go through the list again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Briefly.

MR. JONSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been meetings dating back over a year ago dealing with the fiscal realities facing the province and facing education. Those meetings have been very valuable in terms of providing input. We are compiling that data. We are listening to what is being said, and we will be setting our direction, our plan accordingly.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the minister: will the minister acknowledge the anger and the worry amongst Albertans and agree to extend the November 1 time limit that he put on Albertans and allow for input to go well beyond that time limit?

1:50

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the input from roundtables, the workbook responses have come in very, very well. We have a great deal of information to work from. We have the results of our own roundtables. We have the results of local meetings being held across the province. I think it should be emphasized to the hon. leader that there is also another very important thing here. There is a time when it's time to make decisions, to set out the plan and start working with Albertans on it.

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

Liquor Sales

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Liquor privatization is leading to a community hangover. Police chiefs are concerned, community leaders are concerned about the downside risks to liquor privatization. To the minister responsible for the ALCB: what is this government's response to Alberta citizens given that the Edmonton Police Commission has issued warnings that increased crime is a likely result of the ill-conceived and uncoordinated attempt to privatize liquor sales?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, the orderly distribution and zoning of liquor outlets will be controlled by municipal bylaw. At about a quarter to 12 or in that range I phoned Jan Reimer, the mayor of the city of Edmonton, and had a discussion with her in consideration of changes in bylaws that they are making to address some of the concentration of licences that may go into a certain area of the inner city. I indicated to her that the Alberta Liquor Control Board would certainly send forth a caveat or letter to all the licensees saying that there is no guarantee to the licence that you could indeed set up in a location, that that would be subject to a business licence and zoning as established by bylaw and regulations within the city.

It is not our intention – and I don't think it is funny when you make reference to certain things related to alcohol. The inner city does have problems. We addressed those in response to the city and other organizations when we left a store open at 8 o'clock in the morning so that people wouldn't access other types of products when they indeed had a problem. We will work with the city or any municipality in order to address concerns they may have. I indicated also to Jan Reimer that we'd be willing to work with any police force. We will have inspectors going around ensuring that these licences carry the most strict prohibition against distribution of these products to minors or any other type of conduct that may cause problems in our society.

MR. BRACKO: What about the rest of Alberta?

My first supplementary to the same minister: what steps is the minister prepared to take to assist Albertans in preventing disruptions to the amenities of residential neighbourhoods?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I addressed some of that in my first response. Indeed I had indicated to the chairman, Mr. Bob King, that again he contact the city of Edmonton or any other municipality that would like to discuss this and see if there are requirements that we could put in, as we had in the '40s. We used to have that

no liquor store or a premises selling liquor product could be closer than 200 yards from a school.

We are willing, as the liquor board has always been, to sit down and discuss some of the licensing. We did not put any direct location to a licence until the municipality had authorized it. All licensees, all 325 that were sent out, had the caveat put on the application that this licence was of no value until the municipality had either given a business licence or a location under zoning. You asked what we're willing to do. We're willing to go back and talk with municipalities and see if there's any other direction that the liquor board can take in those sensitive areas.

MR. BRACKO: To the same minister: are you willing to then go back and place a moratorium on privatization until law enforcement measures and planning bylaws are in place across the province?

DR. WEST: No, Mr. Speaker. This is not a privatization issue. This is a zoning and a social issue within our society, and we will continue to work on those together.

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

Urban Parks Program

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1989 the previous government announced an urban parks renewal program. It's my understanding that this is a 10-year program to spend \$82.2 million on parks throughout Alberta. My question is to the minister responsible for urban parks renewal. How much money has been distributed to date on this program?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, including the \$13.8 million in the current budget, \$40,325,000 has been given out in grants under the 10-year phase 2 program, which affects 11 cities.

MR. SMITH: In light of the government's deficit reduction plan can we stop this program now?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, all programs, including the urban parks program, are under review. My department is subject to the same budget restrictions as all other departments. While we are looking at ways of keeping urban and rural areas attractive and interesting places for tourists and Albertans to live in, we are reviewing the viability of that program at this time.

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

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can this government, Mr. Minister, withdraw these funds to stop the proposed construction of a \$3.4 million footbridge slated for construction in Edmonton in 1994?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, it's most instructive and most encouraging that a Calgary MLA should address an issue of great concern to many Edmonton constituents.

Mr. Speaker, should the city of Edmonton apply for funds for that particular footbridge project, the project could still be turned down based on the funding available in the program this year. There is not enough funding left in Edmonton's allocation for the current year, which is approximately \$2 million, to pay for the projected \$3.4 million required for the footbridge. As I said just a moment ago, I can give no assurance as to the allocation of funds for this program in the future.

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

Registry Services

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Privatization day, or to a lot of Albertans doomsday, looms closer and closer for Alberta registries. The plan has clearly fallen apart. To the minister responsible for Alberta registries: can the minister assure this Assembly that any cases of conflict with giving driving lessons and also issuing driver exams are being weeded out?

DR. WEST: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, why has the minister failed to listen to concerns being expressed by a number of large organizations, such as the Alberta Motor Association?

DR. WEST: I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, he's trying to outdo the record set by Stock yesterday for the shortest answer.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister put on hold this privatization until a well-thought-out, detailed transitional plan has been fully developed?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, back when I was solicitor general, I started on a process of looking at motor vehicles and starting a privatization model. That was over two years ago. During that time and since that time we have worked in pulling together one of the most comprehensive plans in development of a registry system that I know of. Yesterday we made a news release that indicated that we had finalized the selection process, which had selected roughly 69 new outlets that will go across the province in seven major cities. We are in the final signing of those contracts and negotiations and look forward to the day when there will be a multiplicity of networks that will better serve Albertans in registries in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Three Hills-Airdrie.

2:00

Employment Standards

MS HALEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the last several months and years we've all known about large numbers of layoffs by employers in this province. This is a big concern to organized labour right now and a concern to my constituents as layoffs are an indication of the condition of our economy. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Has he in fact been keeping track of the number of layoffs in Alberta this year so that we have some sense of where our economy is going?

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, often with public-sector layoffs, with the concentration there, we lose sight of what is happening in the private sector. Section 8 of the Employment Standards Code requires employers who have 50 or more employees to give four-weeks notification if there's going to be a layoff. Under that provision we're able to keep records. In 1991 there were approximately 4,600 employees who were laid off under that provision, in 1992 there were about 3,600, and to date this year there are about 1,600. So it's showing a decreasing trend, at least to this date this year.

MS HALEY: Can the minister tell me, in light of the many concerns facing organized labour, including layoffs, whether he

is anticipating any immediate changes to the Labour Relations Code which would allow for greater stability of Alberta's labour force?

MR. DAY: Well, the member is making a reference to greater stability of the work force. For an example or a barometer of stability you could look at days lost because of work stoppage, and this year the national average is about 5.06 days lost per 10,000. Ontario, for instance, is higher than the average, and B.C. is up around 12. Alberta is below one; it's .96. So it's not a perfect record, but it's the second lowest in the country and I think reflects stability. We don't anticipate at this point major changes to the code, though we are listening for suggestions.

MS HALEY: As employees in the private sector move from one job to another in our economy, could the minister indicate to me whether there has been an increasing number of employment standards complaints against former employers?

MR. DAY: Well, the member is using the phrase "former employers." In looking at those statistics, we're talking about employees who file a complaint after they've left their workplace. So they're not in fear of losing their job because of filing a complaint. This is in fact after they've left. The main areas that complaints are filed under are nonpayment of wages and termination pay. Last year there were something like 5,300 of those complaints, and this year to date it's somewhere over 3,000. So there's a decreasing amount of claims laid by employees against employers after they've left their place of employment.

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

Farm Fuel Rebates

DR. NICOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government rebate program for farm fuel is scheduled to end in 1993. As of yet no application forms for renewal have been provided, and many farmers have begun to question the government's motives after losing part of their tax rebate on gas and diesel fuel in August. My question to the minister of agriculture: will the minister announce his intentions for this program so that farmers can begin to plan for the coming crop year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are now in the throes of developing our three-year plan as well for agriculture. Part of that process, of course, is going to be the budgetary process as well as the program delivery process, and that will encompass all program delivery. The AFFDA program, which has been part of our farm programs for many years, will be part of the programs; it will be considered. After we have gone through a complete consideration of all programs and the delivery of all programs, only then will we make the final decision on all programs.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

DR. NICOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the minister of agriculture: are you considering any changes in the level of the rebates or putting restrictions on the potential use of fuel by farmers?

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Obviously, this is an important program to the agricultural community. The agricultural community is the

main engine of this province. It employs more people than any other industry in this province, and it produces revenues that we have to be very, very conscious of. We work with the agricultural community and work with them very closely. We will be consulting with the agricultural community to determine just what their wishes are. After we've consulted, only then will we make the decisions.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

DR. NICOL: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Again to the minister of agriculture: is the minister prepared to open discussions on concerns raised when farmers using this tax-free gas enter into competition with the commercial trucking industry?

MR. PASZKOWSKI: That will be one of the considerations that will determine the extent of the continuation of this program. Obviously all factors will be considered in the final decision. We must realize, however, that the agricultural community is a very important element and industry in this province. It is our intention in working very closely with the agricultural industry to allow them to assist us in the final decision-making process.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat, followed by Calgary-North West.

Rural Physicians

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are for the Minister of Health. As you know, I represent a riding that is roughly 50 percent urban, roughly 50 percent rural. In the rural areas one of the main concerns is the quality of health care and the availability of medical doctors. The president of the Alberta Medical Association recently stated that the Alberta Medical Association was considering stopping new doctors from billing medicare. In rural Alberta we have an extremely hard time getting doctors. My question to the Minister of Health is: could we not use the AMA's idea and allow doctors to bill in rural Alberta and not allow new doctors to bill in urban Alberta?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly there is a concern in many rural communities on accessibility to physicians. However, we have introduced in the province a rural physician action plan, which shows great promise. It is working. I think it will take some time to see it fully working. Our government tends to lean more to less regulation rather than more. The province of Ontario has been attempting a similar type of activity and has met a considerable amount of resistance. So it would be my preference that we continue to work through the rural physician action plan to encourage people, because as a rural member myself I guess I would prefer that the physician who works and lives in my community is there because they want to be.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it were to apply to general practitioners, could this concept also apply to specialists such as surgeons and anesthesiologists so that some of these people could be available in rural Alberta as well?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, through the rural physician action plan we are offering opportunities to upgrade physicians for anesthesia, for radiology, and for surgery and doing that through co-operation with our medical schools in offering

upgrading and training. So that is another really important component of the rural physician action plan, and I believe that it is going to continue to work.

I would remind all hon. members that we are going through and have gone through a very extensive consultation process as to how we deliver health services in this province. We would expect the reports from that consultation to be with us very soon, and I'm sure some of these very issues will be addressed in that.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you. Could we impose a condition on new medical graduates that would ensure that they work in rural Alberta up to three to five years after graduation?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a possibility. However, I should also say that we do today offer incentives for people who practise in rural communities. Some of these are financial; some of these are training. They're enrichment opportunities. I think we want to encourage people to work in rural communities, and we want to address those problems by looking at why they do not. I would want to just mention that the University of Calgary and the city of Drumheller and the Drumheller hospital have a pilot project in place right now where they are linking the rural physician with the school in order to tie in a liaison in sort of a peer working. I think ideas like that perhaps are more in keeping with our philosophy of less regulation and encouraging people to work in parts of this province because they want to.

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

2:10 Magnesium Plant

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government claims that they want to get out of the business of being in business. Well, one business we're still in big time is the magnesium business. We're still on the hook there with a \$102 million loan guarantee and \$27 million in interest so far. Our total exposure is over \$130 million. My first question to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism is this: since a deal to purchase the technology was signed and agreed to in principle six months ago, why is the government refusing to reveal to Albertans the additional cost that we are going to incur in this failed magnesium plant?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, we're still in the process and in discussions with respect to whether or not we will be purchasing the technology requirements with respect to this matter, and we will continue to evaluate it. There are a number of questions that are currently before me that I do not have the answers for, and when I do have these answers, we will be announcing our decision.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've got 102 million bucks, and we still don't have the operation licence to operate the thing.

My supplementary question to the minister: how much money did the government squander in payments to Burns Fry to try to sell MagCan before the minister finally clued in that you can't sell a product that you don't have the licence to operate in the first place?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, when I became the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism in the latter part of June,

there were a number of very difficult files that were placed before me, and this is one. This is a very difficult file. I have been the minister since the latter part of June, and I will deal with this file. There are a number of questions that I do not have the answers to. The answers are being searched out for me, and when I do have a conclusion to this matter, I will announce it and make it known to the people of Alberta. All funding, all involvement of taxpayer dollars with respect to this particular matter will be made public once a decision has been arrived at.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on this plant, like all the others, the government claims they've got a long list of buyers, so my supplementary question is: with the price of magnesium in fact dropping due to production from the Commonwealth of Independent States, if they have this long list of buyers, why didn't they sell this thing six months ago or better, when the economic situation was far more favourable than it is today?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat again that I became the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism in the latter part of June. There was an election in the province of Alberta on June 15. This file is before me. I don't believe that there are buyers out there for the Magnesium Company of Canada Ltd. We're trying to get a handle on how we deal with the so-called request or the need for certain patents. It may be that the final decision will be that we will exercise the option to buy them. It may very well be that we will exercise an option not to purchase them. When we have concluded this and I'm absolutely assured in my mind that I know everything there is to know about the Magnesium Company of Canada Ltd. and when a decision has been made on it, we will make that decision public. I repeat again what I said a few minutes ago: we will make all of the funding parameters, requirements, and investments that have been taken by previous administrations with respect to this matter public.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bow Valley, followed by Sherwood Park.

Education Funding (continued)

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. Presently in Alberta there are school jurisdictions that spend \$22,000 per student and ones that spend \$3,500 per student. I realize that in some areas transportation costs are higher, but I don't feel that that would account for over \$18,000 in difference. Assuming outcomes are similar, how can you justify that huge regional difference in the cost of education?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I think that first of all we do have to recognize that there are certain special cases in the province where there are factors in addition to transportation which provide the need for increased expenditure and increased resources to be available. The example that comes to mind would be the Northland School Division. However, I certainly have as a priority dealing with the whole issue of more equitable resources being available to school jurisdictions. The fact that there are these rather marked inequities among school jurisdictions in their ability to raise local funds from their local assessments is at the base of school jurisdictions being able to spend somewhat in the area of the levels described by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there any possibility of redistributing funding to have the \$22,000 jurisdictions become more cost efficient?

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think there certainly is. First of all, we have to keep this focus in the context of coming up with an equity funding approach or program for the province. One of the things that has been drawn to my attention through the roundtable process and through our regional meetings and from the Alberta School Boards Association as well is that we should be looking at a form of independent audit procedure whereby the actual effectiveness and efficiency with which school boards use funds is evaluated.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

DR. OBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would not a funding formula based on per capita with allowance for excessive transportation distances promote a more cost-effective and efficient education system?

MR. JONSON: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, a funding formula for public and separate school boards whereby there was more equitable funding per student in terms of the resources provided would improve the situation.

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

Special Waste Treatment Centre

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Minister of Environmental Protection confirmed that hazardous PCBs and PCPs are now coming into Alberta from British Columbia and Saskatchewan as well as from the Northwest Territories. While the minister chooses to dismiss public consultation on the basis that this is only for a test burn, Albertans concerned with the importation of hazardous waste do not make this subtle distinction. To the Minister of Environmental Protection: now that Albertans have seen an erosion or compromise of the Alberta-only policy, what actions has the minister taken to convince these other jurisdictions that our borders are indeed closed to the importation of hazardous waste?

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For clarification, waste isn't coming into the province at this point in time. The time frame that we license waste to be stored is only 60 days. We are going to have these test burns probably at the end of January or the early part of February next year, and as a result of that the materials will be coming in later on this year but again only to supplement the PCBs and the PCPs that we have in the province of Alberta. The hazardous waste treatment centre has been very, very successful in eliminating – and I repeat “eliminating” – PCBs in the province of Alberta. We have virtually no PCBs in the province of Alberta, but we need PCBs and PCPs to do a full and thorough test of the new kiln at the Alberta special waste treatment facility. Without that kind of test we can't be sure that the new kiln is operating appropriately. So we are operating on that kind of a regime.

The hon. member said: what are we doing to inform other jurisdictions of the Alberta-only policy? I believe very seriously, Mr. Speaker, that all of my colleagues, environment ministers in other jurisdictions, are well aware of the Alberta-only policy.

Every time I get together with them, regardless of whether they represent NDP governments or Liberal governments, they are saying: when and if you ever change your policy, we'd certainly like to be contacted because we'd like to use your state-of-the-art facility.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

2:20

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once the facility is operational, given the size of the newly expanded facility, is it feasible or is it economical to operate the massive, state-of-the-art, one of a kind facility with Alberta-only generated waste, or aren't we going to need the other waste?

MR. EVANS: It's a good question, Mr. Speaker, and it was dealt with very, very thoroughly by the NRCB, the Natural Resources Conservation Board, when the request was before that board for approval to build the new kiln. The process, very transparent and all encompassing, reviewed the waste stream that we currently have in the province of Alberta and decided that it was in the public interest to grant the approval for the new kiln based on social, economic, and environmental considerations. So, yes, indeed there has been a review. Yes, indeed the NRCB has come to the conclusion that the kiln was required for Alberta waste.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This issue will not go away. I'm wondering if the minister will take some leadership, stop dancing around the issue, and initiate the public consultation in a meaningful and constructive way to deal with the issue of importing hazardous waste.

MR. EVANS: Well, there are a number of issues in the Department of Environmental Protection, and certainly the process for dealing with hazardous waste is one of those. I have, as I mentioned in my earlier response, had a number of requests from other jurisdictions because they recognize the state-of-the-art facility that we have in the province of Alberta, they recognize that they do not have facilities that can deal with their own waste stream, and they recognize that they do not have the money to create those kinds of facilities. We take those kinds of concerns into account. Certainly the Premier, when he was the minister of environment, stated and I have repeated that before the Alberta-only policy would be changed in any significant way, we would entertain a very thorough and comprehensive review of the policy with Albertans and make sure that they had an opportunity to review the issue and have input into the process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-East.

Hospital Administration

MR. AMERY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. Twenty-one years ago the Calgary General hospital operated close to 1,000 beds and was managed by a president and a vice-president. While I acknowledge that advanced technologies have changed delivery systems for health care, although the Calgary General hospital is currently operating at close to 500 beds, it's now run by a president and four vice-presidents and many other layers of management positions. Can the minister tell us why the Calgary General needs more high-paid

management positions while the hospital is running at a lower capacity?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has indicated on a number of occasions, it is imperative that all of our boards and agencies look at the administration and the management side. In the case of the Calgary General I should point out that its function today is quite different than it was 21 years ago. It carries a number of programs that it didn't and, indeed, in that time frame has also included the management of the Peter Lougheed centre. So there is a considerable difference.

Active beds are not the best measure of a hospital's efficiency or needs in this day and age because of the number of outpatient programs and ambulatory care areas that are in. I should say that the Calgary General has been a leader in the province in developing ways of reducing inpatient stay times, of offering community care support where people can be released from hospital sooner. So while it is important to look at that, I think we have to look at the total function of what the Calgary General does today that it did not do 20 years ago, when it was more of a community hospital than a specialized hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MR. AMERY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the minister's answer, but in keeping with the idea of streamlining health care, will the minister consider starting at the top by getting rid of these high paying positions so the frontline hard workers like nurses, technicians, and janitors, many of whom are struggling to make ends meet, can keep their jobs?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, Calgary General is autonomous, as are all our other hospitals. They are board governed, and it is my expectation that the board will operate those facilities in the most efficient and effective manner and certainly be looking at their staff to ensure that patient care is of the utmost interest. It is really not the minister's role to hire or fire anyone within those institutions. But, again, through the consultation process that we have embarked on, I think all of our institutions are committed to becoming more efficient, more effective. Certainly I know that their bottom line is that they are concerned with their staff. Many of the changes that have occurred in our hospitals such as the Calgary General have been reductions at a management level. Again, I believe it's very responsible of those boards to look at that first.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, followed by Little Bow.

Tax Reform Commission

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta Tax Reform Commission was set up to listen to the views of Albertans on the competitiveness of the tax regime, but there are questions as to whether this government is being open and accountable and providing full information. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister explain why he's failed to provide to municipalities and the Tax Reform Commission access to the second report of the industrial property tax review, 1990, as he promised in the Legislative Assembly, and the Local Government Financing Review paper to municipalities?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I've been in full consultation with the executive of the AUMA as well as the counties and MDs and

other municipalities in the province and have indicated to them that through discussions in the three-year plan and some other directions that we're taking, it would be beneficial in view of those reports to study the context of our fiscal review before we probably look at some of the details of those plans. There is no doubt that the tax review commission that is out there will study in detail some of the materials that were previously looked at and some of the sensitive areas such as machinery and equipment tax and other types of tax forms. I'm in the process at the present time of going around to four locations – I was in Medicine Hat last Friday, and I'll be in Calgary this Friday – talking to all the municipal people involved – the Reeves, the mayors, and other administrators – and we'll be discussing this very subject.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's not what I'm hearing from mayors and Reeves.

To the Provincial Treasurer: how can the minister claim that this is a complete review of the tax regime when the government is refusing to share all available information on machinery and equipment, corporate pooling, power, pipe, and cable TV assessment with the commission and municipal and educational authorities?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I have heard of no concern raised by the Tax Reform Commission in the carrying out of its duties that it is short on information. In fact, I'm told that they have an abundance of information at their disposal. They are most of all and most importantly listening to Albertans at a series of some six or seven public hearings throughout the province. I would suggest that if the hon. member has a specific complaint, she perhaps bring that to my attention through my office. If there's a lack of information out there, we would do our best to fill that hole.

I would refer the hon. member to the Local Government Financing Review matter. That is a report that was not in fact prepared by the government. It was prepared by the various member associations. It is not a report that belongs to the provincial government. It is a report that belongs to the four associations who were a party to its preparation.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Secrecy leads to disaster, and I would think you would have learned by now.

To the Minister of Education: will the minister assure Albertans that he will await the recommendations of the commission before a decision is made on equity funding, corporate pooling by another name?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated – and this is still the case – that it is my hope that an equity funding program will be able to be announced at the time we move into our spring budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Little Bow.

2:30 Remington-Alberta Carriage Centre

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today are to the Minister of Community Development. This is the particular time of year when many volunteer organizations start lining up participants for their local parades, participants such as the Remington-Alberta Carriage Centre which has received substantial Alberta funds to preserve an historical part of Alberta. Would the minister indicate to this Assembly why the Remington centre would charge a \$300 to \$500 appearance fee to bring their carriages to a local community for a fair day?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, the Remington Carriage Centre provides a facility outreach program. The fee referred to by the hon. member is a cost-recovery fee. The fee is required to keep the carriages in repair, to pay for the costs of transporting the carriages and the horses, and to promote the facility.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Have the major parades that the Remington Carriage Centre has appeared at, such as Lethbridge and Calgary, paid the appearance charge?

MR. MAR: The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is yes. Last year they participated in 10 parades, and this year they participated in seven parades. All of the parades that they appeared at outside of a 10-mile radius from Cardston were charged the fee.

MR. McFARLAND: Mr. Speaker, I won't ask if the charge that's levied covers the messy job of postparade pollution cleanup, but I would like to ask the minister if any of these small communities that don't have the revenue base from the parades have any means of offsetting this charge.

MR. MAR: I've not considered that possibility, Mr. Speaker.

Grande Alberta Paper Ltd.

MR. LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that some timber inventories in the past have been inaccurate, there are concerns whether there is sufficient timber in the Grande Prairie area for the existing operators and for the new proposal by Grande Alberta Paper. My question is to the minister responsible for Environmental Protection. Will the minister assure us that the environmental impact assessment will be required to provide information on the available timber supply not only for the GAP project but also for existing operators in the area?

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The environmental impact assessment is with respect to the timber that is likely to be required by Grande Alberta Paper and in terms of the processes that they are talking about both for their paper operation and for their pulp operation. It would not extend to other operators in the area because they have already received an approval and are in existence.

MR. LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, would the minister then assure us that the terms of reference of the NRCB will require them to examine the timber supply for both the GAP project and other operators in the area?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I've mentioned before, the NRCB has a requirement under law to determine whether a project is in the best interest of the province of Alberta based on social, economic, and environmental considerations. That is their mandate. The terms of reference will be developed after they have had a chance to review the approved response to the environmental impact assessment guidelines. For me to contemplate what the final terms of reference will be for that process would certainly be too early in the process to do.

MR. LANGEVIN: My final question, Mr. Speaker, again to the minister responsible for Environmental Protection: will the minister put pressure on his cabinet to defer further allocation until there has been an independent assessment of the amount of timber in the High Prairie, Grande Prairie, and Whitecourt areas with respect to the needs of existing operators and new proposals?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, government in the province of Alberta operates with the citizens of the province of Alberta. We review on a constant basis the amount of timber that is available in northern Alberta, the existing operators, those who want to become involved in timber harvesting. We will continue to make decisions based on that kind of input and the very best available information we have to determine formulas and to use those formulas to determine the available fibre. That is a promise by this government: to involve the public in our important decision-making processes.

Speaker's Ruling Decorum

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period has expired. Before the Table calls the next item, the Chair would like to inform members of the Assembly that we completed 15 questions. The Chair just wishes to point out what progress can be made when there's a reduction in the amount of heckling and noise and other things going on in the Chamber. I know the Chair risks giving this congratulation to the Assembly because it's happened before: the very next day things deteriorated. Nevertheless, the Chair is eternally optimistic and wants to give credit where credit is due: to all members of the Assembly to allow this to happen. It only leaves two members who didn't get time to be recognized today.

Thank you.

head:

Members' Statements

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

Liquor Sales

MS HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government's decision to privatize the retail liquor business has resulted in more than 90 provisional licences being granted in Edmonton to date. More than 20 of those are in or close to the inner-city residential neighbourhoods which are just north of the Boyle Street strip. Residents of McCauley, Norwood, Alberta Avenue, and Central McDougall are all extremely concerned about the possibility of too many liquor outlets in their neighbourhoods. Most of them are not necessarily against privatization, but they say that they would like to take a reasonable number and that the outlets should be located in parts of the neighbourhood where businesses already exist, not on residential streets or near schools and churches.

Inner-city neighbourhoods are particularly vulnerable to this move by the provincial government. For example, 15 years ago the housing in McCauley was deteriorating rapidly and it looked as if the neighbourhood was going to fall to business development. Absentee landlords became more common, and people who owned houses stopped looking after their houses as well. Residents have fought back with the development of housing for the disadvantaged and many other initiatives in the neighbourhoods, but they fear that so many liquor outlets will compound the social problems that they are trying to clean up. They worry that prostitution, theft, violence will increase, as well as policing costs. They doubt

that the public sector will monitor the sale of alcohol to minors. It is regrettable that the minister responsible did not take time to properly plan the implementation with the communities and municipalities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before moving to the next statement, would there be consent to revert to Introduction of Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

head: **Introduction of Guests**
(*reversion*)

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly teacher Linda Howitt, parents and helpers Christine Witherspoon and Don Wesolosky, and 26 students from Greenview school in Mill Woods. They are seated in the public gallery, and with your concurrence I'd ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the House.

head: **Members' Statements**
(*continued*)

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

Diabetes Month

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who has had personal experience with diabetes recognizes that it remains a very serious affliction to many thousands of Albertans. Indeed, the Canadian Diabetes Association indicates that diabetes is Canada's third most frequent fatal disease. The Canadian Diabetes Association has been leading the fight against the disease since 1953 through 160 branches in every province and territory and just this past Wednesday, October 27, launched its annual diabetes awareness month. As in past years, Alberta media personalities have volunteered for the celebrity challenge. This year, however, their role has been changed so that they will now serve as honorary area managers for the association's fund-raising efforts in this province during the entire month. Those activities include the annual door-to-door campaign which will run from November 1 to 7.

2:40

The Canadian Diabetes Association remains the largest nonprofit, nongovernment donor to diabetes research in our province. Its work is of critical importance to an estimated 120,000 diabetic Albertans and last year contributed \$711,000 to various Alberta research projects including those of the two diabetes research training centres in Edmonton and Calgary. In addition, the association's education and self-management programs are substantially improving the quality of life for many diabetic Albertans. As a member of this Legislature I am proud to say that the government of Alberta has contributed through the Department of Health by providing a total of over \$2.4 million to assist diabetic Albertans who use insulin and have no private insurance. Obviously, the work of the association has been supported in a very large part by the generosity of individual Albertans.

The association operates a toll-free line, 1-800-563-0032, and I would encourage my colleagues and their constituents to access it.

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

Library Services

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Klein government is cutting funds to Alberta's public and regional library systems in spite of public outcries for more educational support, not less. Albertans are also seeking more information, and one of the major sources of information is our libraries. Libraries work very hard to meet the demands of their consumers and the challenges of new technologies. They want to meet their clients' increasing demands for information. Duplications of collections throughout the province are not a solution. Networking of information is. Technology is now available, and there's innovation in this field. Albertans are fortunate that dedicated professionals in the information field know their clients' needs, understand the difficult economic times, and value these new technologies.

In northern Alberta the colleges, the regional library systems, Athabasca University, the town of Fort McMurray, and the Alberta vocational colleges have decided to co-operate on a resource-sharing project called Noralink. They realize the value of their respective collections and the importance of them to their clients. The colleges, the AVCs, and the university see Noralink as a way to access more information for students in their distance education program, and the other libraries see Noralink as a way to provide their members with a broader range of materials. While there is complete co-operation among all the stakeholders, this project does need provincial and federal support, which is available through the Canada/Alberta subsidiary agreement on northern development.

If Noralink comes on line, it would be unique in the province and would become the model for a provincewide data base resource-sharing network. Albertans who wish to upgrade or continue their education would have access to all the resources of these learning institutions. Further on they may even have access to information systems available through the Alberta Research Council, for example. Therefore, it is incumbent on the ministers of Community Development, Education, and Advanced Education and Career Development to recognize the importance of such co-operation and to give Noralink their full support for the benefit of all Albertans.

To quote from the objectives of the Noralink pilot group of libraries, we must be committed to the principle that, quote, in a democracy network libraries form a vital conduit through which information flows to all people, unquote.

Thank you.

head: **Orders of the Day**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seek unanimous consent of the Assembly for the following motion:

Be it resolved that the Assembly waive Standing Order 8(2)(a) in order to now give consideration to second reading of Bills Pr. 2, Pr. 5, Pr. 6, and Pr. 17.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat, is the Assembly prepared to give such consent?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: **Private Bills**
head: **Second Reading**

Bill Pr. 2
The Youth Emergency Services Foundation
Amendment Act, 1993

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 2, The Youth Emergency Services Foundation Amendment Act, 1993.

I urge that the members of the Assembly support this Act. It has been duly reviewed by the Private Bills Committee and is entirely in order.

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

Bill Pr. 5
Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1993

MRS. GORDON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 5, Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1993.

This amendment extends the boundaries of the tax-exempt land of Canadian Union College to include land on which will be constructed a new science centre.

I urge all members to support this Bill.

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

Bill Pr. 6
Mennonite Mutual Insurance Co.
(Alberta) Ltd. Amendment Act, 1993

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

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move second reading of Bill Pr. 6, the Mennonite Mutual Insurance Co. (Alberta) Ltd. Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is simply to allow this insurance firm to offer all kinds of insurance with the exception of life insurance.

It has been reviewed by the committee, and I recommend it to the Legislative Assembly.

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

Bill Pr. 17
Canadian Health Assurance Corporation Act

MR. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 17, being the Canadian Health Assurance Corporation Act.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 17 read a second time]

CLERK ASSISTANT: Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders for Second Reading.

Point of Order
Private Bills

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Second reading of Bill Pr. 15 is on the Order Paper standing in my name. I'd like to move Bill Pr. 15, Alberta Seniors' Legislature Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. N. TAYLOR: It's on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That matter was foreclosed when the Assembly accepted the report by the chairman of the Private Bills Committee.

MR. N. TAYLOR: A point of order then. He filed that report, but on the Order Paper is Bills for "Second Reading." This is the official business of the House. It doesn't matter what report he makes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, when the Assembly accepts a report, then it's ordered. That becomes an order of business of the Assembly.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I agree that we cannot throw anything that we accept out, but there's nothing wrong with moving anything that he has not in the report. I mean, Mr. Speaker, I'd be very interested in where you get this ruling. It's on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. But the report was that Bill Pr. 15 not be proceeded with.

2:50

MR. N. TAYLOR: No, it did not, Mr. Speaker. I challenge you to read the Blues. All he did was move certain ones, and he didn't say certain ones not be proceeded with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, he did.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Did he?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair is prepared to check the Blues to see what the motion was that the Assembly accepted. If in fact it is not as the Chair believes it to be, the hon. member will be recognized to raise the point of order.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Then if the report shows that he did indeed say Pr. 15 was not to be proceeded with, we could call for a standing vote on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will remind hon. members that this matter came up in 1991, I believe, when somebody wasn't happy with the report by the chairman of the Private Bills Committee. There was a little debate on that report, and then the House divided, and there was a recorded vote on the fact that there was some unhappiness with the report of the chairman of the Private Bills Committee. If there was that much unhappiness with the report of the chairman of the Private Bills Committee, then there should have been some debate on that during the report stage when the motion was made.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Bills were listed to be moved forward, and the Bills were listed to remain, but then we must in the House vote on each one of those private Bills. That's exactly what we're doing now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad you've referred to the incident that occurred in this House in 1991. The hon. Member for Redwater was a member, certainly, at that time and I'm sure with some time to ponder will recall that the issue was debated at the time that the motion was brought forward by the chairman of Private Bills as to whether various private Bills should be accepted or rejected. Today in this House, if my memory serves me correctly, there were two Bills that the

chairman of Private Bills moved be accepted as presented – that was Pr. 5 and Pr. 6 – two Bills that should proceed with amendments, Pr. 2 and Pr. 17; and two that should be rejected, Pr. 3 and Pr. 15. The question was put by you, Mr. Speaker, “Does the Assembly concur in this report?” Again my recollection is that it was unanimous, both sides of the House. That is the end of the issue. We cannot resurrect this. It is now a decision by this House.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order: if it is exactly as he said – and we'd have to check the Blues – then why do you vote on the ones that have been accepted? It seems to me that each one has to be voted on. That's his report. So why bother going through the charade of voting for Bills Pr. 2, Pr. 5, and Pr. 6 and not on the others? I heard his report, yes. This is what happened. We're not arguing that. I'm not rejecting the report, but surely if we're saying moved – pass Pr. 2, pass Pr. 5, pass Pr. 6, pass Pr. 17 – the next move should be reject Pr. 15. In other words, we're supposed to vote on each one of these. Suppose there were 14 Bills. Is the House trying to say that all 14 – it's going to one part this way, part this way, and part that way? We already recognize the fact, if I may say so, that we vote on each one individually after the report is filed.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair would refer hon. members to Standing Order 101, which says, “Private Bills, when reported by the Private Bills Committee, shall be placed on the Order Paper for second reading.” Now, where they presently appear, they're there for information's sake. They're not there to allow members to call them for second reading whenever they feel like doing it. Those Bills can only be called for second reading after the committee has recommended which ones will be called and which ones won't be called, and if they're not recommended for calling, they will never be called. I'd like to get this straightened out.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Well, why move any of them then? Why not just take his report, which we do when the chairman of the committee reports? They file the whole report. We get a chance to vote on the individuals in the report. So he moved the report. Yes, that's fine. Then we're voting on some and not on others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would just remind hon. members that there are different rules for private Bills than there are for any other legislation that flows through this place. The rules for private Bills are entirely different than government Bills and private member's public Bills. The private Bills move in a different way, and this is a difference from the other mechanism. Private Bills cannot proceed at all until the Private Bills Committee has had a chance of hearing what they're about and makes the decision whether or not they should proceed. Then when the Private Bills Committee does report to the Chamber, the Chamber either accepts or rejects that report. Nothing happens until the Private Bills Committee makes a recommendation, which can be changed by the Assembly, but in this particular case the Assembly accepted the report as given, and Bill Pr. 15 was recommended not to proceed. Therefore, it cannot be called for second reading at this session.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I know, Mr. Speaker, but Standing Order 100 says exactly as you say. “The Private Bills Committee shall make a report” – that's been done – “on every private Bill.” That's been done.

(2) The report shall identify those Bills which the committee recommends be proceeded with . . . [and] amendments, or not proceeded with.

That's true; he did that.

(3) The report shall have attached to it any Bills the committee recommends be proceeded with and any proposed amendments. Then we go on to 101.

Private Bills, when reported by the Private Bills Committee, Not rejected or anything: “when reported.”

shall be placed on the Order Paper for second reading.

That's all it says, “when reported.” It doesn't say once accepted or rejected; it says when reported.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is one possible interpretation of the standing order, but it is not the interpretation . . .

MR. N. TAYLOR: It gives us a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: It's not the interpretation that the Chair feels was the intent of the drafter or of the Assembly when it accepted these Standing Orders. The Chair regretfully has to rule that Bill Pr. 15 cannot be proceeded with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It doesn't matter whether people agree or not.

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

**Bill 210
Individual Property Rights Protection Act**

[Adjourned debate October 27: Mr. Coutts]

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

MR. COUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the chance to speak to Bill 210. This debate allows us to focus attention on a subject that is too often taken for granted in our society, the protection of individual property rights. The importance of property rights to our society is unquestionable. It has been recognized for centuries that if a person works to acquire property, it is their democratic right to be able to control and enjoy that property. Of the four fundamental democratic rights, the right to enjoy property is equal in importance to the right to life, the right to liberty, and the right to security of the person. In fact, the right to own and enjoy property is directly related to each of these other rights.

3:00

Even the most primitive forms of life can be said to possess property, Mr. Speaker. A plant has a particular piece of earth for its property which is occupied by its roots. If deprived of its soil or property, the plant will die. So, too, does a person's property provide them with the tools to live. It is our ability to own and control property that enables us to provide food and shelter for ourselves and for our families. Property is really necessary for survival.

As well as providing us the tools to live, property also provides liberty. The right to own and enjoy property gives us the freedom to do what we like when we like. We can set certain goals for ourselves, and because of the individual property rights we are free to achieve these goals. Property rights also provide for personal security. Because we have the right to own property, we can plan

for the future. We are able to collect property resources, to put them away for when we need them, saving them for a rainy day. This, Mr. Speaker, is the financial security and peace of mind that results from the right to own and enjoy property.

There can be no dispute that individual property rights are integral to our society and provide the foundation for each of our other democratic rights. By strengthening and protecting an individual's right to private property, we also strengthen and protect the rights of life, liberty, and security of the person. I agree wholeheartedly with the principle of Bill 210, and we must recognize the importance of individual property rights and offer this right greater protection in our province. We can achieve this by advancing this piece of legislation specifically dealing with the issue of property rights.

As much as I agree with the principle of Bill 210, I must admit that I have a few concerns about the content of the Bill and would like to make a suggestion for improvement. One effective amendment to the Bill would be a definition of the term "property." As it stands now, Bill 210 contains no explicit definition of what we mean by the term "property." If the term is not clearly defined in this legislation, it would be up to the courts to interpret, and this may result in the Bill being used for purposes for which it was not originally intended.

We generally think of the term "property" in the traditional sense as referring to such things as real estate, stocks and bonds, and material goods. The term can refer to other things as well. In some cases property may be defined as intangible assets, such as patents and copyrights. Also, we should be aware of the concept of new property that has originated in the United States. New property refers to public-sector grants such as welfare, unemployment insurance, and social security. The American courts have decided that many public-sector benefits perform traditional functions of property and should therefore be redefined as property in the law. In a number of Supreme Court cases these benefits have changed in status from gratuities or charitable gifts to become property with all of the constitutional guarantees that protect private property in the U.S.

The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." In 1970 the American Supreme Court recognized that there is a property interest in welfare benefits and warrants a hearing being held before benefits are terminated. In the United States once the government has established a system that creates a claim of entitlement for an individual, the due process clause will apply should the government decide to discontinue the entitlement.

We can only speculate how courts in Alberta would interpret the term "property," but we could avoid arbitrary interpretation by defining more clearly the types of property that are to be protected by this Bill. If the term is not properly defined, there is the risk that our courts will follow the example of the American courts, and this may be beyond the scope of our intentions for Bill 210.

Bill 210, therefore, lays the groundwork for improved recognition and protection of individual property rights in this province. If we can agree on the principle that Bill 210 represents, we can build on this base to come up with the legislation Albertans need: to have their right to the enjoyment of property protected. Protecting an individual's right to property is one of the most important functions a government has, and we must do our best to fulfill this function to the best of our abilities. What stability can this government offer the people of Alberta if we tell them: we recognize that you have worked hard for what you have, and we will protect your right to enjoy it.

Join me in supporting the principle of Bill 210 and make sure that individuals in this province receive the protection of private property rights that they are democratically entitled to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to have the opportunity this afternoon to join debate on Bill 210 at second reading. I just say that I expect botanists across the province are rejoicing, having heard the most recent comments from the Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod. I've heard a lot of fascinating and interesting theories in terms of what ought to be a basic human right, but considering it from a plant's perspective, I must say, is genuinely a refreshing approach and perspective I've never viewed before. It certainly demonstrates, I think, that when we start talking about property and we start talking about the things encompassed by Bill 210, it can be an incredibly elastic sort of exercise, depending on the perspective of the individual observer.

I also had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to review the comments by the Member for Calgary-Montrose in moving Bill 210 the other day and then also the comments by the Member for Calgary-McCall. I thought what I'd do initially is just take a look at Bill 210 and identify some of what I'd consider to be the key features, and then I'll come back and discuss in some greater detail.

Firstly, if we look at clause 1, reference there to "the enjoyment of property," it's clear. It's not ownership. It's not possession. It's "the enjoyment of property."

Secondly, property itself is not defined. I understand the comments by the Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod that he'd like to see it clarified. Well, surely, Mr. Speaker, this whole Bill revolves around what we mean by property. This isn't an ancillary or an incidental feature of the Bill. If we are not all clear on what we mean when we say "property," how can we possibly support this Bill and move it on to the next reading? The whole proposition, the whole piece of legislation turns on what property means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other key feature, the third critical feature, in Bill 210 is due process. Due process isn't defined in the Bill either. I'll come back in a moment and say that there are enormous differences between what due process is understood to mean when American courts have interpreted articles 4 and 15 of the U.S. Constitution. I think when the U.S. courts look at those two amendments to the U.S. Constitution, there's an entirely different legal system at work there than exists in this jurisdiction. So we've got to be mindful of those differences. That's always the problem when you take concepts that have been developed and are part of the law in another land and sort of import them and transplant them here. The transplant may not take, and the organ may not survive.

3:10

The fourth feature I just highlight before I go further is in section 2 of Bill 210, the reference to "every government agreement." So it's not just every law of Alberta that's to be construed and applied in a particular way but also every government agreement, and a government agreement is defined as being any agreement to which the government of Alberta is a party.

Now, moving on from those general comments and then trying to deal with it more specifically. The mover the other day was arguing that there is ample historical underpinning and cited the English Bill of Rights of 1689, the declaration of the rights of man of 1789, the Constitution Act of 1867, and in error, I submit, the universal declaration of human rights in 1948. He says that these

instruments all recognize the importance of human rights. Well, with respect to the mover, if you look at human rights legislation and legislative protection internationally, it doesn't recognize this kind of right at all. In fact, I refer the member to the Roosevelt Atlantic charter in 1941, the Moscow declaration of 1943, the Potsdam conference in 1945, the San Francisco conference in 1945, the U.N. Charter itself, and then finally the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. In each of those important documents, instruments the focus is on human rights, not on economic or property rights.

We did have an experience – and I didn't see this mentioned in debate the other day – in the Canadian Bill of Rights, which had a similar provision to that which is cited in Bill 210. Now, it's important to note that when our Charter of Rights and Freedoms was adopted in this country, we expressly did not include this type of a property right, and there were good and compelling reasons for that. Members have only to refer to the extensive debates in the House of Commons, the more extensive and voluminous submissions by the Canadian Bar Association, by a host of other organizations in terms of why this is problematic.

The principle arguments advanced by my colleague for Calgary-Montrose, as best I can determine, are three. He suggested firstly that Bill 210 would “encourage a more just system of compensation.” Now, he said, “by Albertans,” – and I assume what he meant was for Albertans – “whose right to enjoy their property is denied or violated.” So that's the first argument he advanced. The second one is that it would contribute to the prevention of criminal offences against property and would help the victims of property crimes. Then the third reason he advanced was that this would teach our youth “the value of property and respect for the right to own and enjoy property.”

Before I deal with those three reasons, I just want to come back and say again that the biggest single problem of Bill 210 is the absence of a definition of property. I think it's clear, when I heard the mover of Bill 210 in second reading, that what he contemplates is not just real property, land, but he also contemplates personal movable property: TV sets, cars, ladders, dishwashers. There are very different considerations that apply to those two different kinds of property, but I think what it indicates is that the member opposite in moving Bill 210 is thinking of property as a thing. Well, property is not a thing. Property is a collection; it's a bundle of rights.

Now, the last speaker said: well, we don't want to leave property for the courts to define. I agree that sometimes that's a scary proposition, Mr. Speaker. We don't want to leave the courts with too much latitude. In fact, what we have here isn't simply a challenge for the courts; it's also a challenge for philosophers. I can think of at least 15 philosophers that have all got different views in terms of what property means, but the general consensus is that it's not a thing. It's not whether it's a piece of land or a dishwasher. It's neither of those things. It's a bundle of rights.

When we get talking about a Bill like this, we have to be a lot clearer in terms of what's to be covered. I can put to members a quote from Waldron, who wrote a text called *The Right to Private Property*. He said, and I quote: the statement that property is one of the rights of man is an ancient and familiar one, but it is ambiguous, concealing perhaps a variety of quite different claims. Then he goes on to identify four very different types of claims that we sometimes usually refer to as property. With this kind of uncertainty I think it would be irresponsible to incorporate this into the law of the land when there's such a broad range of interpretation of what property means.

When some people talk about property, they talk about immunity against expropriation. When I first heard the comments from

the member in moving this Bill, I thought that's what he was talking about, because he talked about expropriation. There are enormous problems with fair treatment of property owners in terms of expropriation; I agree. I share the mover's concern that we want to do a better job, that we want to do a fairer job of ensuring that Albertans who are going to forfeit property, whether it's to a municipality or to the province of Alberta or one of its many agencies or bodies, that that citizen be treated fairly and equitably. I agree with the member. He went on in moving this to not just deal with expropriation and land rights; he then went on to talk about movable property or what lawyers call personal property.

Another interpretation of property is some kind of natural property right. This is this theory that individuals left to their own devices will gain control of natural resources in a variety of ways. Well, this becomes really confusing. I think that if we start saying that all Albertans have some kind of an inherent right to certain kinds of property in the province without being clear in defining that, we may be creating enormous problems for the government of this province in terms of administering and managing our resources, husbanding them and using them as appropriate, and as electors instruct governments to do.

The third meaning that's sometimes given to property is this business of eligibility to hold property and the fact that certain groups shouldn't be excluded from holding property. Well, that takes us down a different path.

Then the other theory or meaning of property is this notion that there's a general right to have private property and if you own private property, it has some kind of a moralizing effect on citizens.

I think it's sufficient to simply say that there's no clear understanding among philosophers, there's no clear understanding among the courts, and there's clearly no understanding to which all 83 members of this Legislature would agree on specifically what property is.

I want to be helpful to the mover of the motion. If we want to isolate expropriation problems, I'm prepared and I expect my colleagues are to work with the hon. member in terms of reviewing our expropriation legislation. Let's find ways to make sure that we provide decent compensation, adequate recourse for individual property owners. That's an issue we can focus on. I say with respect that Bill 10 is clearly not the way to address that narrow, specific kind of mischief. All members want to be responsible lawmakers, and that means we define the mischief and then we come up with specific legislation to address it rather than opening a Pandora's box of multiple conflicting interpretations.

3:20

I think the other problem has to do with this whole business of due process. There are two kinds of due process. There's a procedural due process over here, and then on the other hand you have a substantive due process. In Canadian courts we have clearly defined due process in terms of being procedural due process. It's only in the American jurisdiction where they've gone down a very different path, and they've given courts the power to view due process as a substantive issue. Well, that means that the American experience is interesting, and it may be instructive in some ways, but it's of little relevance in terms of determining what courts will or ought to do with this kind of wording in Canada. It's a very different concept altogether.

In fact, section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which many people creatively and imaginatively tried to use as the key or the door to get in substantive due process – those arguments have been rejected. The highest courts in this country now have said, “When we're talking about due process, we're only talking

about the procedural aspect, not the substantive aspect." So what we're left with is this: if you take Bill 210 on its face, in effect it says that the enjoyment of property can't be interfered with except by due process. All that means in Alberta is that it has to be pursuant to a contract or pursuant to a statute or pursuant to a regulation. As long as the taker of property can bring himself or herself under one of those three types of legal justifications, they can do whatever they wish with it.

It seems to me that this is sort of like throwing a boomerang and having the thing come back and smack us in the head. The point is that we've gone in a complete circle. We have in Alberta a stack of laws and regulations and case law that say that before I can take the property from the Member for Calgary-Montrose or any other member, I have to follow certain processes and certain rules and certain regulations. If I don't do that, I'm vulnerable to an action commenced by the person who's being deprived. We deal every day in this Chamber with setting out an incredibly elaborate network of safeguards and protections.

I'd point out to all members that there are many creditors in this jurisdiction that consider this as a debtor's paradise. I'm sure members have heard that observation. There are people who argue that it's more difficult to foreclose on private mortgages, on properties in this jurisdiction. You don't have a personal covenant that you can sue on. Your remedies are restricted unless it's a mortgage granted to a Crown agency. We have strict limits here in terms of seizure under chattel mortgages and conditional sale contracts.

Now, I don't know if the member intends that we should further relax those protections or eliminate some of those protections that exist for property owners and debtors in Alberta. It seems to me that's something we have to address. I just alert the mover of the motion to the fact that I think there's a very large body of Alberta businessmen who would like to see movement in the other direction, not in terms of making it more difficult for creditors to be able to access security rights. I say this just to point out that when you talk about due process, it gives little comfort, I think, to somebody who's been deprived of their property in the sense that they already have virtually all of the protection I can think that one would look for.

Secondly, the member talked about prevention of crimes against property, but the reality is that here we have an enormous portion of the Criminal Code of Canada that already sets out proscribed offences dealing with property. We've got offences against rights of property, sections 321 to 378. I encourage the member to review those sections. If he feels something's missing, he might also review sections 428 to 447, willful and forbidden acts in respect to certain property, sections 379 to 427, fraudulent transactions relating to contracts and trade. So, hon. members, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to go back to Magna Carta to find that in this jurisdiction we have an elaborate, comprehensive body of rights and protections for property owners to protect people from being unfairly, unjustly deprived of enjoyment of their property.

The only way this is going to discourage crime – maybe we could issue little decals or stickers similar to Block Watch stickers. We could put them on our cars and our TV sets and our homes warning people that this is a basic right we've got and you're not to interfere with it. I mean, short of putting the decals up, we have no additional protection and would have no additional protection under Bill 210. In fact, I'd argue that having it represents a step backwards and we end up with fewer rights rather than more rights.

The third thing is that the mover had asserted that this would teach youth the value of property and said that this was a problem. Well, my suggestion as a parent of a 13-year-old child is that I think most children in our society grow up with a very keen

awareness of what property means, in some respects keener than their parents. I'm really skeptical that adopting legislation like this is going to allow our young people to have a better appreciation or a better understanding of what property means in terms of owning possessions and looking after possessions than is the case currently.

The Member for Calgary-McCall emphasized that property rights in his view are the foundation of our society, and then the last speaker made similar comments. Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll let other speakers carry on and finish that off.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville-Viking.

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just say a few words in favour of Bill 210, but before I do that, the debate on Bill 210 certainly has taken an interesting twist in the House. The Member for Calgary-*Buffalo* was somewhat concerned about the analogy made earlier by the Member for Pincher Creek-Macleod when he referred to a plant. I'd like to remind the member across that the other day we heard the Member for Fort McMurray talk about fondling women's underclothing, and I wonder where that fits into our debate this afternoon. I suppose what he does in his spare time is his own business.

It is really essential to this debate that we understand how important the right to own and enjoy private property is. Our society would not be what it is today and we would not have the life we have today without the right to own and enjoy property. The settlers of this fine province came to Alberta with a promise of starting a new life. Some were fleeing persecution and hardship; some were looking for the chance to pursue their dreams. Whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, they all chose to come to this province because they knew that if they worked hard, they would be rewarded. If they settled and worked a piece of land, it would be theirs to keep and enjoy. This province like any democratic society was built . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair sincerely regrets having to interrupt the hon. member so close to the beginning of his remarks, but Standing Order 8(2)(b) requires that we move to the next order of business.

head: **Motions Other than Government Motions**

Economic Strategy

206. Moved by Mr. Bruseker:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to implement an economic strategy which is aimed at improving the situation of all small businesses in Alberta, including the elimination of all loans and loan guarantees to private businesses.

[Debate adjourned October 19: Mr. Doerksen speaking]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

MR. DOERKSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been two weeks since debate was adjourned on this motion, so I will try and bring you quickly up to speed in terms of where I was at. You will recall that I was affirming my unequivocal support of small business, that the opportunity to be in business for one's self and to be independent is a dream which most Albertans have had and is a fundamental part of our makeup. I quoted the familiar phrase which said, "Go west, young man, go west." I was elaborating on some economic benefits to Alberta. I was at point number four, and that's where I'll continue my speech and talk on this.

Per capita productivity in Alberta as measured by GDP was \$28,866, 16 percent higher than the national average.

3:30

The fifth point was that the long-term outlook for the province of Alberta looks very promising. The Conference Board of Canada – and I have a copy of their report here – forecast the “real GDP in Alberta . . . to grow by 2.6 percent, on average, over the 1991-2010 period.” The same group forecast that the unemployment rate will fall “steadily to a level of 5.4 percent in 2010.” That’s an interesting statistic, and again I point out that that’s from the Conference Board of Canada. That’s a very favourable outlook for this province indeed. Domestic demand will remain constant as the population grows at a projected rate of 1.3 percent over the long term. Rising oil prices and an increased demand for natural gas will also have positive effects on this province’s economy. I note that the senior vice-president for the Bank of Montreal, when he was speaking in Red Deer last week, I believe, painted a very good picture for the province of Alberta, and they’re pleased to be in business.

Point number six. Among all provinces Alberta consistently records the highest per capita private and public levels of investment.

Number seven. Alberta has one of the best labour records of any province in terms of the fewest work days lost due to strikes.

Number eight. Alberta has the most favourable tax regime of all provinces. We do not and will not advocate a provincial sales tax. We have the lowest transportation fuel tax in Canada. Our personal income tax rates are the lowest in Canada; the corporate income tax rate for small business is 6 percent, among the lowest in Canada. There are no general payroll or capital taxes. Mr. Speaker, Alberta enjoys the lowest taxation rates of any other jurisdiction in Canada. That is our competitive advantage. To exploit that advantage to our own benefit, we must hold the line on current levels of taxation.

On September 27 of this year the Provincial Treasurer announced the formation of the Tax Reform Commission. Its terms of reference will require the review of all taxes in Alberta, both provincial and local, in order to answer a number of questions and provide recommendations to ensure that we retain that advantage.

Mr. Speaker, these few statistics and projections that I have mentioned suggest that Alberta is the place to be if you want to be in business. This government has already taken steps to put an overall economic strategy in place that will benefit all Albertans, including small business. This government is committed to a four-year plan to balance the budget. Large accumulated debts threaten our standard of living and our ability to maintain high-quality health and education systems.

We must also endeavour to improve the efficiency of government operations. We cannot expect success in our initiatives to reduce the deficit and debt of this province if we are unable to limit the growth of government. The voluntary options program was just one means of reducing the size of Alberta’s civil service with compassion and sensitivity.

There are other areas in which this government can rationalize its operations. We must look to privatization of services where private-sector operators can provide the same or better levels of service at a reduced cost. Some might see the role of Big Brother as having a beneficial impact on Alberta’s economy.

Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues I want to affirm and say along with them that Alberta is open for business.

MR. SPEAKER: The question now before the Assembly is on Motion 206 proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary-North West. All those in favour of this motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 3:36 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Abdurahman	Hanson	Sapers
Beniuk	Henry	Sekulic
Bracko	Hewes	Soetaert
Bruseker	Kirkland	Taylor, N.
Carlson	Langevin	Van Binsbergen
Chadi	Leibovici	Vasseur
Collingwood	Massey	White
Dalla-Longa	Mitchell	Zariwny
Decore	Percy	Zwozdesky
Germain		

Against the motion:

Ady	Gordon	Oberg
Amery	Haley	Paszowski
Brassard	Havelock	Pham
Burgener	Herard	Renner
Calahasen	Hlady	Rostad
Cardinal	Jacques	Severtson
Clegg	Jonson	Smith
Day	Kowalski	Sohal
Dinning	Laing	Stelmach
Doerksen	Lund	Tannas
Dunford	Magnus	Taylor, L.
Evans	Mar	Thurber
Fischer	McClellan	Trynchy
Forsyth	McFarland	West
Friedel	Mirosh	Woloshyn
Fritz		

Totals: For – 28 Against – 46

[Motion lost]

Tuition Fees

208. Moved by Mr. Severtson:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider removal of the tuition fee ceiling on foreign students studying in Alberta postsecondary educational institutions and allow the universities to determine and set such levels.

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

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s a pleasure to rise today to discuss Motion 208. Under Alberta’s present tuition

fee policy students who are not Canadian citizens or landed immigrants of this country must pay twice the amount in tuition fees that Canadian students would pay for the same program. That rule was set by the province in 1991 after a lengthy dialogue between Alberta advanced education, students, administrators, board chairmen, and other stakeholders. Motion 208 suggests removing the tuition fee ceiling for foreign students and allowing the universities to set their own visa students' tuition levels. I feel that this issue of foreign student tuition levels is something that the government needs to look at.

3:50

There are concerns among my constituents and among Albertans as a whole that we are subsidizing the costs of education for foreign students. The tuition fees that universities charge to all students are only allowed to total 20 percent of the university's or the college's yearly operation budget. This means that the taxpayers of Alberta pick up the tab for the remaining 80 percent. This is at a time when we are trying to review education spending on a line-by-line basis, making sure that Alberta taxpayers are getting the best value for their hard-earned dollars. I think that we owe it to them to at least review the method by which we assess foreign student fees to determine what action if any should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, making a determination on tuition charges for foreign students is one that this Assembly should stay out of. I think that the best way to ensure that foreign students' fees are charged so as to benefit the education system for the long term is to allow the postsecondary institutions themselves to set their own fee levels. This government is currently pursuing a deregulation strategy of staying out of the way of growth in this province. We are attempting to make our laws and our regulations more responsive to the needs of Albertans in the 1990s. We are trying not to interfere directly in areas where government does not belong. Allowing postsecondary institutions to set their own fees and removing restrictions on those fees would be a good start in that direction. This would be a very progressive move on the part of the government.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

We are involved in tough fiscal times. Programs in health, education, and social services are being reformed to come in line with the fiscal realities this province is facing. We are completing several public consultations including *Toward 2000 Together*, *Tourism 2000*, and *Creating Tomorrow* in an effort to involve Albertans in the creation of a future for this province. We are currently working on a number of roundtables on education and health to get the opinions of Albertans on how best to deliver the programs in each area. Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development is launching a particularly ambitious campaign called *Adult Learning: Access through Innovation* to get the view of Albertans on the future of adult education in Alberta. One of the things that we are being told through these roundtables and discussions is to let the people that have the expertise make the decisions. As part of this year's budget we are setting out a multiyear funding target for government departments, schools, hospitals, and postsecondary institutions. We're leaving the task of meeting those goals to the people who can best do the job, the people who work directly in those areas. It is our job to stay out of their way and to let them decide how best to allocate their resources.

I like this approach of letting institutions and organizations determine how to meet their goals, and I think Motion 208 fits

into that. It would enable universities to determine what tuition fees should be paid by international visa students accessing the programs. Mr. Speaker, I feel it would be a valuable tool for the universities to have a say in the fees they charge. At the same time, there's no guarantee that the fees for foreign students would go up as a result. Each individual province is responsible for setting their own foreign tuition fees. Some provinces such as Saskatchewan allow their universities to set their own foreign student fee differential. As it turns out, the foreign student surcharge as a percentage of the Canadian tuition fees tends to actually be less than the Alberta surcharge. What Motion 208 suggests is not a gouge on fees paid by visa students but, rather, a move to letting universities decide what fees they should charge. This 20 percent cap would still serve as a limit on increasing tuition fees even if the ceiling for foreign student tuition were removed.

I have no intention with this motion of trying to reduce the amount of foreign students coming to study in Alberta. Currently, more Alberta students go out to other areas to study than students from out of Alberta come to study here. In 1991-92 approximately 5,000 Albertans went to study in other provinces, while 3,400 students came to Alberta to study. Approximately 86 percent of all full-time students at Alberta public colleges, technical institutions, and residential universities in '91-92 were from within the province of Alberta. Visa students are not taking up an unreasonable amount of space in our postsecondary institutions. In 1991-92 visa students in Alberta's postsecondary institutions accounted for only 4.3 percent of the full-time enrollment. These statistics show that visa students are not denying Albertans spots in our postsecondary education system.

I have mentioned *Access through Innovation*, a consultation process being set in motion by the Minister of Advanced Education and Career Development. The department is currently accepting written submissions and getting ready for a second round of discussions on adult education. The minister has indicated that he will recommend a policy framework for our adult education system by the spring of 1994. It is my hope that the foreign student fee differential will be part of these discussions, allowing the universities to set their own fee levels in accordance with Motion 208. Removing restrictions on how high those levels can be would be a positive step.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, it would fit well into this government's policy of allowing postsecondary institutions to do their job. It would allow universities to set visa students' levels in line with their particular needs and the needs of Albertans and the needs of the universities. Lastly, it would lead to a more responsive and more effective system for determining the level of fees of students coming here from other countries to study. It'd be one more way that we could assure Albertans that their tax dollars for postsecondary education are being well spent.

Thank you.

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

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion before us, probably more than any we have had in front of this Assembly this session, deserves to be resoundingly defeated. I think that, at best, it might be considered to have arisen out of a concern for the financial position of our postsecondary institutions or schools, and, at worst, I think it can only be considered another xenophobic attack on those whose skin colour isn't white.

I speak to the motion from two perspectives: first as an Albertan who benefited from being allowed to pursue graduate

work in another country and, second, as an instructor and researcher who had the good fortune to work with visa students from a number of countries, from around the world.

Let me first talk about the world of scholarship and scholars who belong to an international community and why they value that membership. Parnell in *Dateline 2000* outlined rather succinctly the importance of attracting international students to our campuses. From a strictly selfish point of view, international students provide our Alberta students with another perspective on the world. It reflects a world beyond our borders in social, cultural, political, and economic terms. They help our scholars develop international communication skills that will enable them to think, work, and act in a global economy. Those students provide an entry for us through research, technical assistance, study, and service to help resolve international issues. Many of the issues, particularly economic issues, that will face our province in the future are destined to be those as a result of our links with other countries.

4:00

Today there is some urgency in our need to establish more contacts. New knowledge and human resource development will be critical to the world's economic development in the future. To be successful in that world, other languages and understanding other cultures will become increasingly important for our students. They must be familiar with the political, they must be familiar with the economic, and they must be familiar with the political context in which those they are dealing with work. We are going to need more, not fewer, international students if our postsecondary schools are going to be truly internationalized.

Let me share with you for a moment the experiences my wife and I were privileged to have as Albertans attending a university elsewhere as nonresident students. It remains one of the most positive and fulfilling experiences of our lives. We were able to obtain the kinds of programs which at that time were not available on an Alberta campus. We were also able to complete what is considered an important part of most postgraduate programs; that is, the obtaining of at least one of your university degrees from a non-Alberta institution and the accompanying perspective the attaining of such a degree entails. We were welcomed by the faculty, by the students, and by the community as one of their own. Every effort was made to ensure that during our time on that campus our academic programs filled our needs, the world-ranked scholars with whom we wished to work were available to us, and everything that could be done to defray costs and augment our income was made available to us. The friends we made during that brief two-year stay abroad are among our international friends today. All this was at a time when that particular state in which we were studying was under severe financial stress and there had been severe cutbacks to the university we were enrolled in.

During our time abroad we established research and study links that were useful to ourselves, our professional colleagues and, most importantly, our students throughout our careers. We became part of the international community in our fields of study. We became part of a worldwide community devoted to research and devoted to study programs. When we required external examiners for our doctoral students, we drew from a pool of international experts whom we knew from more than a scholarly reputation. At that time we were part of a group of Albertans studying abroad who outnumbered by far the number of non-Albertans studying in our province. It is interesting to note that today that situation has not changed. There are more Albertans studying at postsecondary institutions outside our borders than there are visa students studying within our province.

As a faculty member, it was my good fortune to work with visa students from a number of countries. Students from Africa, Asia, Europe, and Australia all were an important part of our student body. Students, colleagues, and professors alike learned much from those visitors. Some of us were motivated to enroll in other language courses. Some became involved in international projects to improve education abroad. Some of us took their new ideas and notions to help solve problems in our own school systems. Some became involved in international research projects comparing education across countries. Many of the projects brought additional funds to our institution, and most importantly, they gave an international perspective to our studies and research. We also learned some intangibles from those students. We learned from our Chinese students the price that some were willing to pay for academic freedom. We learned from our Tanzanian students how precious the right was to research any topic we pleased when we pleased. We learned from our British students other ways of serving our own students.

If we look to the future, as scholars such as Parnell have done, we see predictions that much more will be done to encourage international students than is presently the case. Parnell indicates, for example, that colleges and universities in North America will strengthen international intercultural studies to include cultural, intellectual, and career goals; there will be a broadening of the programs offered at universities and colleges on this continent. He goes on to predict that there will be a new interest in cultural and ethnic studies brought on by greater economic contact with countries around the world and the opening of trade arrangements with those countries.

Conversational language studies will be added to the degree requirements now facing students. Most of us who were fortunate enough to have attended doctoral programs know the ritual dance we all went through learning to read a foreign language so we could enter those programs. Parnell indicates that that will no longer be the case. You're really going to have to know the language. You're going to have to be able to speak it as part of a graduate program requirement.

Colleges and universities will join with high schools to develop continuous language programs spanning grades 11 through 14. The language programs we've had have been the best efforts we've known how to accomplish with the resources we've had, but the presence of international students means there will be greater opportunities to develop programs that link school districts and public schools and separate schools with colleges and universities and develop programs that are continuous from public school through postsecondary education.

All faculty are going to be pressed to add an international component to their existing courses. From math to medicine, there's going to have to be an international component. Our international students will be involved in more language and tutoring our students. It's unfortunate that the press which international students in our country often get is negative, that they are teaching and some students have difficulty with the language. We haven't taken full advantage of their language capability and the possibilities that exist for them to link up with our own students and really help them learn a language they can converse in competently.

Parnell predicts that government agencies will be created to fund and encourage international education, that it won't be left to chance. Government will actively step in and create agencies that will promote the coming of more students into this country. Colleges and universities will establish campuses in other countries to enhance international education, and other countries will establish schools in North America as part of their international

education programs. We've seen some of that already in our province, and Parnell indicates that is destined to grow.

I turn now to the darker side of this motion, a side that seems to lurk beneath the surface of several of the statements that have been made about the non English speaking in our province. When one walks around the campuses I'm most familiar with – the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, Grant MacEwan College – one is struck by the racial and ethnic diversity. Blacks, natives, Asians, and whites mingle socially and in classrooms. But there are those among us who do not approve of this richness. They have singled out for criticism the members of this group or the members of that group, usually identifiable by skin colour, that are found in these schools. They point to them as aliens, call them foreigners, and indicate that they are illegitimately somehow or other taking the place of true Canadians. Bigotry aside, of course they couldn't be more wrong. Visa students in our province make up only 4 percent of the student body. When complaints about the numbers of visa students are pursued, it's evident it's the visible minority, most of whom are every bit as Canadian as you or I, who are the target of many of these attacks.

It is quite astounding that at a time when many colleges on this continent are actively seeking students from other countries, we would have a move that could limit the participation of visa students in our own postsecondary schools. It is quite astounding that at a time when the province is making a major thrust to attract investors from elsewhere and encouraging our business community to move into world markets, there would be this move to make interaction among international scholars and researchers more difficult. It is quite astounding that when some universities are going so far as to establish campuses in other countries and other countries are considering establishing campuses here, we would entertain discriminatory actions against visa students. I urge every member to resoundingly defeat this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

4:10

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Varsity.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much. It gives me great pleasure to rise and speak in support of Motion 208. This motion is one, Mr. Speaker, that particularly affects me and the constituents of Calgary-Varsity, as the University of Calgary falls within the riding. I've already noted the management excellence at the University of Calgary, its president Murray Fraser and his efforts to bring spending into line with the funding he has.

I will mention, Mr. Speaker, that the University of Calgary is hosting more than 18,500 full-time students and over 3,900 part-time students this academic year. Of that student population, nearly 5 percent are visa students and those who attend from other countries. This is slightly above the average visa student presence on Alberta campuses. One could draw the picture that indeed the reputation of the University of Calgary – perhaps it's the strong government representation in the Alberta Legislature – has made international headlines, and perhaps visa students are responding to the greater presence of the University of Calgary than other campuses throughout Alberta.

I'm sure I don't need to explain to the Assembly the benefits of attracting students to Canada and Alberta. The member opposite has been far more articulate and has displayed some personal experiences that I think are important to anybody venturing through the postsecondary experience. Our country offers some of the best postsecondary institutions in the world, and students come from international locales to receive a quality education they can take back to their own countries. In fact, we're exporting

education. We're cementing very strong ties. These are ties, certainly when one looks at the international universities of England, that will pervade trade and business decisions made in the future. I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, for our campus to provide a very strong and positive postsecondary educational experience to these students so we can continue to build on the reputation of this fine country and, of course, this fine province. The students are able to access quality programs in medicine, law, engineering, agriculture, business, liberal arts, sciences, and of course environmental studies. At the same time, a number of Alberta students are able to use opportunities to study abroad in other countries.

This give-and-take, reciprocal relationship between countries is essential to our status as a modern cosmopolitan province in the world marketplace. Indeed, these changes – this reciprocal education and visa students entering the Alberta mainstream and our students studying abroad – probably outline in many respects the Alberta Advantage and our ability to market the strong benefits of this province. International students make a valuable contribution to our economy. It's estimated that each international student spends \$9,000 annually in the community in which they are educated. This is in addition to tuition and other academic fees. So again it's part of the Alberta Advantage to promote this strength we have in Alberta and to continue to vie for attendance from visa students throughout the world.

Of course, they add to the educational fabric. They provide alternate viewpoints, ideas, and expertise to our educational system. They often assume leadership roles upon returning to their country of origin. Again, I think this is very important, because ties made in the educational world are ties that will permeate through to the business world, the world of commerce, trade, and government. It's important because these students will be able to influence trade and investment decisions, and I'm sure they'll remember the Alberta Advantage when they're making those decisions. Generally, they represent clients for services and goods that are exported from this province. I would love to dwell on those products and exports we have, but I know each speaker is limited to only 20 minutes and the strong litany of products Alberta presently exports is something of strength.

The good will that we get from the presence of visa students in our educational system is valuable for Alberta businesses looking to gain access to new markets. As a businessman, I know how important it is to have global contacts. I know how important it is to establish an agency network, and I know how important it is to find some threads of commonality with the business communities abroad. The visa student experience will help cement that.

The motion deals with visa students and the way we assess tuition in a very proactive and forward-looking manner. These same words could be used to describe the advances made by the University of Calgary in the 1990s. This university has led the province in dealing with the fiscal realities facing our postsecondary education system. The university has done this through the implementation of a five-year business plan to support academic priorities, reduce teaching units, cap salaries, and consistently search for more effective and efficient means to deliver programs to students. Indeed, they have essentially taken a businesslike stance to education and provide choice and keep a lid on their expenses and still offer a quality service to the marketplace.

I feel that a natural step in this progression, Mr. Speaker, is to allow postsecondary institutions such as the University of Calgary to set their own tuition fees. Motion 208 is a very good start. It goes part of the distance toward that goal that allows universities and colleges to set their own tuition fees for visa students and removes the restriction on the tuition they are allowed to assess.

An interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, is that Alberta currently charges the second lowest tuition fees in Canada. The government has legislated that a student who is not a citizen or a permanent resident of Canada must pay twice the amount in tuition fees that a Canadian student would pay for the same program.

I am concerned about a raise in tuition fees for visa students, but I have those concerns allayed, Mr. Speaker, by the confidence I have in the marketplace and the ability of the marketplace to make decisions. I feel that this country and this province have a responsibility to assist students from less wealthy countries to allow them access to a quality education. It's important to me that the students from poorer countries be able to return from Canada with an education that is an asset to a developing nation. As an aside, I think it's important that we see that return. I would hate to think that Canada is in a position where we're brain draining the less developed countries. It's really from a support standpoint that we provide this postsecondary education.

I am concerned that raising tuition fees for visa students will ensure that only affluent students will be able to access a postsecondary education in Alberta. Less wealthy students from developing countries must have a fair opportunity to get an education in Canada if our role truly is to fulfill a world leadership position. At the same time, there's no reason for Motion 208 to lead to increased tuition fees. As the hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake has pointed out, other provinces have put the power to set tuition fees for foreign students in the hands of the schools themselves. They've actually allocated some marketplace choice out there, Mr. Speaker. And guess what happened? There was a net decrease in tuition fees based on supply and demand of visa students.

There's no reason to suppose that implementing Motion 208 can in any way lead to increased tuition or block less affluent students from other countries wishing to study in Alberta. Rather, giving universities the authority to set their own tuition fees would inject a sense of decentralized decision-making and a sense of competitiveness into our universities. It allows universities control over the fees they charge, it allows students to make choices for themselves, and it really gets this government out of a decision-making role that is best left to the institutions themselves.

4:20

I am pleased that the Department of Advanced Education and Career Development is talking to the public, postsecondary institutions, and other stakeholders in the access through innovation consultation process. I understand that the minister will be acting on some of the recommendations, and we look forward to hearing those. He's probably working on them right now. I hope one of the results of that consultation will be a postsecondary system that will offer students the best possible product while reflecting the true cost of adult education. It would make the universities' job easier, and all students would be better for it. An education is an investment, Mr. Speaker, as we know in this government.

Motion 208 is an excellent step in this process. It would lead to universities competing to attract visa students and probable lower tuition rates, but we'll let the marketplace decide that. It would be the beginning of a responsive and effective postsecondary education system, and that's why I'm giving it my full support.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against Motion 208. I'm not going to be as generous to the

Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake in believing he's moving this purely from a fiscal perspective.

I firmly believe that the very words of a previous minister of advanced education say it all, and I want to quote from *Hansard*, the 22nd Legislature, page 886:

If one looks across the nation, you find that many institutions set their own tuition fees. You also will notice that many governments, with regard to the public institutions, who allocate funds to the universities by grants simply adjust their grants as a net result of what those tuition fees are . . . I do believe, looking at the costs of our postsecondary system, that we probably will have to make some adjustments in the near future to put them on a more equitable footing in terms of funding. At this time I believe, judging by the participation rate, which is the highest in the nation . . . judging by the number of students, that frankly Alberta probably has a system as good or better than any place in the country.

A further quote from the previous advanced education minister, Mr. Gogo, stated:

To allow certain institutions to set their own [tuition fees] is in some ways similar to letting a youngster loose in a candy store.

John Gogo was a very wise man and is still a very wise man.

So I do not believe the intent of this motion is purely from a fiscally responsible perspective. I began to wonder if indeed the Member for Calgary-Varsity was speaking against the motion, because indeed it is an elitist motion. I began to reflect in 1968 when we came to live in the province of Alberta, a province that was open and made one, irrespective of what your ethnic origin was, feel at home. We look at South Africa, at apartheid, where my family, the Abdurahmans, come from. It was Glasgow university where my husband had to go to get an education. He wasn't admitted into Cape Town university, not because he wasn't educated to be allowed to sit at the same table but because of his colour. I've had three children go through the University of Alberta, and even in those days they were subject to racist comments, whether it be bloody Indian or Paki. I think this type of motion just adds to that. I would suggest to you that the thing we should be doing is reinforcing . . .

Point of Order Relevance

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has a point of order.

DR. WEST: On relevance. This Bill is directed toward tuition fees and that, and we're getting on to completely other subjects. I don't know that members should use a motion to take off on a philosophical bent in some other direction, and I find this Bill is being used by this member to do that at this time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I beg to differ with the hon. minister. I think the issue is relevant. However, I am worried about the citation 23(i), which would be imputing unavowed motives to a member. We're close to it, but I would be prepared to let the hon. member continue provided it is relevant to the motion, which is the issue of tuition.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: It is relevant inasmuch as we're dealing with visa students, Mr. Speaker.

Debate Continued

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: The very reason we've probably got this motion before us is because of the economic status of the province of Alberta. I would suggest we would not be addressing a motion of this nature if we did not have a \$30 billion debt. What concerns me deeply is that because of gross government

mismanagement, we see motions of this nature being brought before this House. We have seen over the past number of weeks where the weakest of society are bearing the brunt of the \$30 billion debt that the past government accumulated. I do not believe for one minute that this motion would indeed do anything to correct the fiscal problems we have within the province of Alberta. In actuality, I would believe that voting this motion down does the exact opposite. I would suggest to you that if we're serious about going into the global marketplace, developing relationships around the world, being seen as a province open for business and being fully open on who we receive within this country and province, that would be the most productive way to go.

We can only enhance the province of Alberta by ensuring that we encourage people, irrespective of their ethnic background or what country they come from, to come to our advanced education institutions to gain the same benefits we as Albertans do when we travel the world looking at further education.

So I'd ask, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House vote against this motion and they vote against what I firmly believe is an intent that penalizes and is indeed elitist to visa students wishing entry for further education.

Mr. Speaker, I have also mentioned the quotes from our previous advanced education minister, Mr. Gogo. I could have actually gone on and quoted our present advanced education minister in answers to questions within this very House.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan, but the time limit for consideration of this item of business is now concluded.

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Second Reading**

4:30 **Bill 10**
Alberta Registries Act

[Adjourned debate November 1: Mr. Germain]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you kindly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Because of the lateness of the hour, I want to correct myself in the *Hansard* record today. I misspoke concerning one segment of the legislation yesterday. On a further review of my notes and the legislation, I have realized that error, and I want to go back.

I had indicated that the funds that would be collected by this registry process would not be impressed by a trust. What I had meant to say was that they would not be segregated and kept in an independent and separate trust account, marked as a separate trust account. That was the mischief that I was speaking to conceptually about that Bill, and I want to apologize to this House and all members in it for the 15 or 20 seconds that I took yesterday developing that erroneous theme, for which I take full responsibility.*

Now, having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do want to begin where I left off there by re-emphasizing that it is a serious and fundamental matter to financial record keeping and financial integrity that when you hold and keep trust funds, you should have an independent and separate trust account that is indicated to be the case. Nothing else makes sense, and I do not understand why, in bringing forward this legislation that is intended to provide community confidence in the integrity of the registration system, the recipients and holders of this government money would not be

obliged to treat that government money as the government's money and not commingle it and co-mix it with their own resources. That was the point I had wanted to make, but I digressed a little bit in my enthusiasm to illustrate the point. I move on by again apologizing for that.

Just to refresh the members of the Assembly, at the very point that this debate was adjourned at 5:30 yesterday evening, I was trying to make the point that the government extracts from their agents in this legislation an indemnity provision, a save-harmless provision, but in the infinite wisdom of the drafters of the Bill, nowhere that I could see do they impose any real and fundamental guarantee on that particular covenant; that is, the covenant to perform and to indemnify the government.

Now, we can only speculate in this Assembly as to how wide ranging the fallout and damages could be from an error of misinformation that is made in the House. As a result of the indemnity, I would be grateful if the government would address in this legislation the importance of having some form of bond, insurance requirement, or some contractual term in their documentation that would cover this. Then that begs the issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker: if indeed these things will be dealt with by contract, are they not so fundamental that the entire contract should be appended and incorporated as a regulation so that all are treated the same and so that the requirements have the force of legislation or at least regulation and not simply contract?

I want to move on in my comments tonight about part 2 of the legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because part 2 of the legislation deals with a government concept. What is the government concept that we have heard enunciated? The government concept throughout has been – and we have heard it enunciated time and time again – that we favour less regulation, less boards, less this and less that. Yet in this particular legislation the entire part 2 deals with setting up yet an additional board, yet an additional requirement that we have more government appointments, more civil servants created to administer something the government is supposedly privatizing and wishes to get out of.

Further down in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, we see on this point that it will require yet another annual report being filed, yet another breakdown of financial information, yet more auditor's fees, yet more accounting fees, yet more publication fees, and filing yet another annual report to the ever expanding stream of government by external agencies, all creating their own bureaucracy and all expending taxpayers' money. I would urge all members of this Assembly, because all members of this Assembly have an opportunity now to move with lightning speed, to retract and slow down the coming into legislative force of this particular legislation. In the interest of all Albertans they should consider doing that.

The next aspect that I want to talk to you about is the oddity of the regulations. Now, you will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we often have regulations in Alberta. Much of our legislation is performed by regulation. The Alberta public has come to rely on the integrity of the publication of those regulations in the *Alberta Gazette* to give them a clear assurance of what the laws of Alberta are. We find in this particular legislation, yet the third or fourth piece of legislation we've debated in this House under the new – remember the throne speech? We were going to have openness – openness we were going to have – and here, buried right in the fine print of this legislation for all Albertans not to see, we find a restriction against publication in the *Gazette*. We have that the Regulations Act, which brings knowledge out there to the folks in Alberta, does not apply to bylaws and does not apply to regula-

*see page 1175, right col., para. 1, lines 3 and 4

tions made by this newly created corporation. It would seem to me that if we have nothing to hide in this legislation, it is a useful vehicle to have these bylaws published so that all may know where they can go and find out what the fine print is about this corporation. When I see, on the one hand, that we say we want openness and, on the other hand, we retract the regulation process from a piece of legislation, I frankly, as one member of this Assembly, do get somewhat nervous.

We then go on in this particular legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to an indication as to the corporation's vast and wide power as to how they control the money that they get from this operation. Let us be clear and let us make no mistake, at the risk of repeating the colourful language and other good words of other members of this Assembly: there is a certain amount of revenue that's attracted through these procedures in addition to the tax that is no tax that will constitute the markup for the registry service. Even if we forget the tax that is not a tax on Albertans and we talk only about the registry fee collection, we find that the corporation is given wide and almost unfettered power as to what they do with the money, including retaining it for future technological development and this sort of thing.

This is taxpayers' money, and the manner in which taxpayers' money should be spent is, from my humble and myopic point of view, a matter that should be discussed in this Legislature. This is what we've been elected for. This is taxpayers' money, and let's get the money into the revenues where it can see the light of day and can be handled by this Legislative Assembly and not by some corporation yet to be appointed, yet to be named, yet to be put in process, and say to them, "Okay; you spend the money how you want to spend the money." So I would indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is another terrible aspect of this legislation.

Conceptually, we also have penalties. The minister in introducing this legislation felt and recognized that there would be some difficulty, that it might be that the leakage of information would be something which could be abused, because the minister obviously knows that one of the most powerful things in the world is information. Is there anything more powerful in the world than information? All of us sometimes wonder whether it's really necessary for people to know how big or how small the mortgage is on our home, how many people are entitled to our homes with us.

Information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one of the most important and most powerful tools in the world. When you have an important, powerful tool, you run the risk of abuse of that powerful tool. So the minister has recognized that risk and has put in this legislation some penalties, but what he has not done is cover the innocent and totally appropriate situation of how people who will obtain and receive that useful information can reuse it.

Let me give you some examples. If a person needs to get a birth certificate, for example, so that they can make a medical diagnosis based on the probable father and the probable mother and the issue of whether you could have a genetically transmitted disease, is that medical practitioner who gets that birth certificate going to be prohibited from sharing that birth certificate with any other medical authority to see if a certain course of treatment is necessary?

Let us suppose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that fortune smiles on you and you get an opportunity to buy in the future a million dollar piece of retirement property. Let's just say that. I'm not saying you will, but let's just use it for the purpose of debate here today. You would want to hire a professional advisor to give you advice on whether that investment is a good investment or a bad investment. The professional advisor you hire might have to retransmit

in some fashion the information you have obtained through this particular legislation. How far and how wide does the net get cast when we do not have a definition in this legislation as to what constitutes improper or proper use?

4:40

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are but a few points. I want to be fair with the time. I know there are many eager members waiting to speak to this piece of legislation. I wanted to emphasize those points and re-emphasize them again. We have another example of a rapid attempt to privatize something. As we saw yesterday, we have once again a concept that is marketed as a purebred animal, and when we wash the mud off the purebred animal, we find that indeed, as we've used in expression concerning other pieces of legislation, we have only a mongrel.

On that point and with that point of view fresh in the ears of the members of this Assembly, I will now sit down and allow somebody else ready, willing, and eager to jump up and speak to this issue.

MR. EVANS: I am ready, willing, and equal to the challenge, but at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn debate on Bill 10.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader has moved that we adjourn debate on Bill 10. Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

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

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the Committee of the Whole to order. Just so that we have clarification, Deputy Government House Leader, we are on Bill 17, giving that consideration, and should we move forward, presumably in this order: Bills 18, 11, 12. Is that so?

MR. EVANS: That is absolutely perfect, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not suggesting the way. I'm asking the way.

MR. EVANS: That was the intention of the government side, Mr. Chairman.

Bill 17
Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act
Repeal Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We're ready with committee study of Bill 17. Any comments?

MR. WICKMAN: The Bill is to repeal the foundation that was created by the former Premier. I do want to speak to it briefly. It's a Bill that our caucus supports. I believe all members of our

caucus support it, but being a caucus devoted to parliamentary reform and exercising the free vote concept, there could be some differences of opinion. We would like to see that free vote over there once in a while too.

Speaking specifically on the Bill, Mr. Chairman, when the Bill came forward to be implemented, we can understand that there were emotional factors involved. However, we had objections at that particular time. We felt that there was a mechanism in place: the AADAC organization. To create a new foundation with a commitment of something like \$200 million in total at the time did seem fairly questionable to us. At the time many, many statements were made by some members of the House that are still here that this foundation was so desperately needed. Obviously there has been a change. I welcome that change of thought.

The one question I do have – and the minister may get the opportunity to address it. It really wasn't addressed last night in the heritage trust budgeting. The \$1 million that is slated under the same foundation name that is now going to AADAC: are there certain components of the foundation that are now going to be shifted to AADAC? If there are, that's actually the way it should have happened from day 1. Maybe it's just going to confirm what we said in this House three years ago. So possibly the minister may get a chance to address that point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Edmonton-Mayfield.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak in support of this Bill, but I do it with a certain amount of trepidation because in fact I would have thought that the Bill would have simply done away with the matter. I mean, it was folly to begin with. I can't fathom how the government of the day was operating when a Premier, the first one, can wake up one morning and have some difficulty with the children and then change legislation that in effect kicks sand in the face of all of those that are operating an agency, that are doing their darnedest to keep up with the drug and alcohol addiction problems, and then the government caucus of the day says, "Yes, that's what we will do."

Here's hoping that that same sort of thing is not about to occur in the present caucus on the government side. My fellow member mentioned something about free votes. A little bit of free thinking in the caucus should have prevented such folly as this. All this legislative change and debate, all of it for what? Why not put a bullet through the head of this thing, this animal, and have it dealt with once and for all?

I don't understand the changes. From "not fewer than 3" to "one or more": what does that do? It's a perpetuation of the same silly organization that had nothing to do in the beginning other than pacify the Premier. That really is silly. It should be repealed entirely.

Now, having had something to do with addiction with members of my close family, I know what AADAC can and cannot do. I know what the family life foundation was supposed to do, and it was oh so glossy and oh so nice at the time. "Nice": the operative word. Here's the one that we were supposed to respect, that in one foul move brought the entire government into disrespect by that motion. Anyone that understood anything that was happening in the treatment of drug abuse and/or alcohol abuse knew that this was the nice thing to do and it had no effect whatever except spending a whole bunch of money developing another bureaucracy and another batch of people. To do what? To do that which was already in operation.

Not that it couldn't be done better. I'm sure we'll all agree that it certainly could be done better. Those that are operating the

current system could say and would say that it could be done better. I'm sure some of the members opposite have ongoing suggestions to make that agency better. One of the things that is not going to make anything better for any sufferer of drug or alcohol abuse in this province is another agency. It was of a predecessor of this government that the statements were oh so lovely and nice. It almost brings one to tears to think of the time and the effort and the money that was spent spinning the wheels and not helping the people that actually did need help. Paying someone to sit and to listen to the concerns of an abuser are the things that legislation should provide for, not for boards, tribunals, and authorities to reinvent some other wheel. I mean, the wheel is and has been in motion for some time, to the credit of earlier governments. They recognized there was a need.

4:50

The need hasn't been fully expanded, and you and I both understand that. I gather there are some studies going on, but certainly there should be on all forms of addiction that are recognized. The most particular one, in my view, and the newest one with the advent of the VLT is the addiction to gambling, that risk-taking that is necessary. I can't see another agency – now, I suppose the government could say that when they do get the final report from Dr. Smith from the university that says that, yes, we have a problem in this province and the province is aiding and abetting in that problem and not providing any kind of solution to that, this government will then go out and form a brand new agency, the VLT agency, saying that, gee whiz, we have to have another total and complete agency that's different from AADAC, on the whim of the Premier.

I think not on the whim of the Premier, but certainly it could happen, and this particular piece of legislation should be tacked up on the wall of that side's caucus room to say: "Look, this is what not to do. This is the thing that we should never, ever, ever get caught in again." Some members opposite I know would never have allowed this to happen if they'd had the strength, the voice in caucus at the time. This kind of thing is absolutely useless. We all know that. I dearly hope that this piece of legislation, Bill 17, will stand in the annals of time as being a turn in direction, one that will say that this is the kind of thing we must not do ever again. We can resolve collectively in this House not to bring frivolous legislation like the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act ever again.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's indeed gratifying to see that there is wisdom on the government side of the House in bringing Bill 17 forward. I think this Bill exemplifies why indeed we need parliamentary reform, which I believe we're beginning to see a little bit of light in the tunnel. In fact, parliamentary reform is going to come to the province of Alberta. What we've seen in the past decade is not democracy working. Indeed it has been the inner cabinets of previous governments that really have governed. I firmly believe that if we had allowed the democratic process to truly be working and healthy within the province of Alberta and within this Legislature, we would never have had to have a Bill 17, because indeed the very members of that government would not have supported it. So it is gratifying to see that this government has acknowledged a mistake of the past. I hope that through this error we will start to see parliamentary reform moving in appropriate time lines to ensure that

democracy is truly alive and well in the province of Alberta and that irrespective of what side of the House you're sitting on, we do truly represent our constituents and Alberta to the best of our ability.

I'd also ask at this time that the government, through Bill 17, be sensitive to the people who need the appropriate support systems, whether it be alcohol or drug addiction or whether it be within the sex offender area, victims of violence. We as a government and as an opposition have to ensure that we find the appropriate funding to ensure that these people get the appropriate support systems, because if we don't do that, all you allow to happen is a continuing decline in your society.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the government for bringing forward Bill 17, and it's my hope that the moneys that are being freed up through this Bill 17 will be put to the most appropriate use.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister without portfolio responsible for the Health Planning Secretariat.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the comments made by members opposite. As you know, prior to the election our Premier asked all of us to look at reducing unnecessary boards and commissions, and this was a pre-election commitment. Following the election the board has resigned, the executive director and the two or three staff have left, and the office has been closed down.

For members opposite who have been concerned about the expenditures of the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation, I'd be happy to present to you the '92-93 annual report, that spells out in detail how much has been spent to date as well as the commitments that we've made and grants to the community and academic and AADAC as well.

It is the intention of this government to live up to those commitments that have been made. The trustee has to be appointed to review those contracts to see if we can wind them down by the end of the year, because some of these commitments do go over a two- to three-year period. Once the trustee has established our commitment to those contracts, then AADAC will be responsible for these research projects.

Mr. Chairman, this foundation was set up to do primarily research, such as the Calgary Distress/Drug Centre, the northern recovery centre, Business Against Drugs, some academic research as well, and also to look at programs for adolescents.

So we will continue, Mr. Chairman, to meet those commitments and have already reduced the administration costs. So I appreciate the comments, and we'll continue the work.

MR. WICKMAN: Does that explain the million dollars?

MRS. MIROSH: Yes. The million dollars is at least for this year's commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we accept the repeal of this Act, Bill 17.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the vote on Bill 17, Family Life and Substance Abuse Act Repeal Act?

[The sections of Bill 17 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to report that progress has been made on Bill 17.

MR. EVANS: I'll move that the Bill be reported when the committee rises and reports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been variously moved that the Bill be reported when the committee rises.

[Motion carried]

Bill 18

Industrial Wages Security Act Repeal Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciated the good input that I received on this yesterday. I just want to recommit to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. There was a request for a list of all people who were involved in terms of being advised, consulted, et cetera, and we will be making that available to that member forthwith.

5:00

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Our only concern with this Bill has been the lack of consultation with the employee groups. If you're going to adequately address that, then we'll speak in support of this Bill.

MR. BENIUK: I think it would have helped immensely if we had known that Bill 18 was going to come back today. Also I think it would have helped immensely if the information the minister said that he has and that he will be providing would have been provided before it came back today. I'm sort of taken aback by the fact that whereas the minister says that he has the information, if I'm not mistaken, we don't have it prior to having to vote on this right now.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, this is an administrative Act dealing with administrative situations faced by the employer. From what I heard when this came up for second reading, there is an understanding and appreciation that this removes duplication, and in fact employees are covered substantially equally if not more so under the Employment Standards Code.

This Act originally came way back in 1928 as the coal miners' wage protection Act. The coal miners' aspect was removed in 1985 because of the Employment Standards Code and other areas covering it. Now this one is being removed. It's an administrative function that frees up a lot of duplication, and employers were clearly consulted. There's no specific employee group in the wide area of the forestry industry, but the employees are covered by the provisions in the Employment Standards Code, provisions in the Woodmen's Lien Act and the code itself. They are totally covered. That's why this is seen and deemed to be and agreed to be redundant. As I've said, I'll send a list of everybody who was contacted on this.

At this point I would call the question on this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood.

MR. BENIUK: Before the question is called, I believe that yesterday the minister indicated that he had also consulted with labour groups. He is now indicating that he has consulted with employer groups and not with any specific labour groups. Is that correct?

**Chairman's Ruling
Decorum**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, one, I'm having difficulty hearing you, and the other thing is that, again, the process is to speak through the Chair. I know it seems odd, but that's the procedure. So you don't ask questions back and forth; you're asking through me. Then whoever is going to reply will do so through the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Labour.

Debate Continued

MR. DAY: Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sensitivity being expressed across here. There's no hidden agenda on this. As I've indicated, the coal miners' situation was dealt with in a similar way quite a few years ago, back in '85. This is a similar provision. This is an administrative function. I would hope members opposite are not opposing removal of duplication and increasing efficiencies. Employees are covered under the Employment Standards Code, under the Woodmen's Lien Act. There are no identifiable employee groups themselves, and even if they had been there, our mission as a government is clearly to consult with all groups affected by changes in legislation. This relieves a heavy administrative requirement, a duplicated one, on government and on industry. That's why there was widespread consultation with industry, and I hope that's understood.

I would call for the question on this stage, the committee stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question's been called.
Edmonton-Norwood.

MR. BENIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to leave the impression that we on this side, that I specifically am opposing the ending of duplication, as was suggested by the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down then.

MR. BENIUK: Was that the former D Six that's now the S Six, the Shallow Six?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's irrelevant. We'll call order on them, and if you'd address your comments.

MR. BENIUK: I just want it to be understood that we support the ending of duplication. On that we are agreed. My question was to the minister. He had indicated that he would provide some information. I'm sort of taken aback, surprised that the Bill came forth again without that information coming. Other than that, we would, of course, support ending duplication. However, I am taken aback by this, and I would like the minister to be fully aware that I am, to put it mildly, flabbergasted that, you know, this would happen in this manner. I do hope this has not set a standard that will be followed on other Bills, that the minister says that he will provide some information, then, bingo, we have the Bill before us without that information first being provided.

MR. DAY: My record in dealing with the member opposite when he asks for information, as indicated today again in tabling motions for returns, is that I am forthcoming with that information.

I have given that commitment, and it will be forthcoming. I would call for the question on this stage of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is called. We're ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 18 agreed to]

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I move that this Bill be reported when the committee rises and reports.

[Motion carried]

Bill 11

Alberta Corporate Tax Amendment Act, 1993

MR. EVANS: On behalf of the hon. Provincial Treasurer we certainly do want to hear the comments at committee stage by the hon. members opposite and any members on the government side of the House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

DR. PERCY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Bill 11, we have discussed the Bill. Our concerns with the Bill were really two in nature. The first concerned section 43 and dealt with extending the period of audit beyond the four years that was in the Mines and Minerals Act. This particular concern appears to be related to the timing of payment of energy royalties and the fact that any subsequent adjustments are on the basis of taxes paid. So our concerns in this regard have been met, in consultation both with the Treasurer and with his staff.

The other section we were concerned with was section 52, that dealt with frivolous court acts. Again, after consultation with the Treasurer and other groups we feel that this particular provision is in harmony with other legislation, with the federal government, so we certainly are not going to propose any amendments to this Bill.

On the broader issue of harmonization I guess we still have a more general concern, and that general concern is that on one hand we are moving towards assessing the competitive position of Alberta, the issue of tax reform and trying to set a tax environment for the province which is attractive. On the other hand, we appear to be moving in several directions that are pre-empting the Tax Reform Commission. This is one case in point, and although this legislation has much merit to it – it's enabling legislation that allows us to harmonize – it's being done in advance of the report of the Tax Reform Commission.

Secondly, we also know that the government is moving forward on the issue of corporate pooling or fiscal equity, again an issue that should be dealt with by the Tax Reform Commission, but it's being done well in advance of that commission.

With regards to the structure of Bill 11 we are in support of the Bill, and we have no amendments to offer to the Bill. So on that note I would move the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The question has been called. Are you ready?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

5:10

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[The sections of Bill 11 agreed to]

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 11 be reported when we rise to report.

[Motion carried]

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Clegg in the Chair]

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills. The committee reports the following: Bill 17, Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation Act Repeal Act; Bill 18, Industrial Wages Security Act Repeal Act; and Bill 11, Alberta Corporate Tax Amendment Act, 1993.

I wish to table copies of the Bills and that these be considered the official records for the Assembly.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. All in favour of the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? Carried. Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we do now adjourn and reconvene at 8 o'clock this evening as Committee of Supply to consider the capital fund estimates.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: All in favour of that motion by the Deputy Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, if any? Carried.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:14 p.m.]