

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, October 24, 1995**

1:30 p.m.

Date: 95/10/24

[The Speaker in the Chair]

### head: Prayers

THE SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

### head: Introduction of Visitors

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, in order to help us commemorate the United Nations 50th anniversary and to honour the many Canadians that have served as peacekeepers in the United Nations missions, we have with us today in your gallery some members of the Canadian Forces from the 408th Squadron and western army headquarters. I would ask that the Assembly join me in welcoming them, and as I speak their names, I'd ask each of them to stand: Major Douglas Martin, who has served as a peacekeeper in the Republic of Yugoslavia; Captain Mark Thietke, who served as peacekeeper in Haiti; Master Warrant Officer Robert Torrie, who has served as peacekeeper in Sinai and the Republic of Yugoslavia; Sergeant Richard Stacey, who has served as a peacekeeper in Haiti; Master Corporal Ken Payne, who has served as a peacekeeper in Haiti; Corporal Bradley Aschenbrenner, who has served as a peacekeeper in Haiti; Corporal Lindsay Parsons, who has served as a peacekeeper in Haiti; Captain Mark Erdman, who has served in a peacekeeper in Croatia; and Lieutenant Colonel Crosman, who has served as a peacekeeper in the Republic of Yugoslavia. I would ask that all the members give our thanks for these members being here today to help us celebrate the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. [applause]

Mr. Speaker, apparently my list is deficient. It's not as organized as the military is. I missed one member, Master Corporal Luc Pesant, and I apologize for that. We do recognize your contribution. Thank you.

### head: Presenting Petitions

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

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With your permission I'd like to table a petition signed by 232 constituents of St. Albert who

urge the government to place a moratorium on any further reductions to the budget for health, and to immediately commence a process to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of health care services

that are presently here.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

MR. LANGEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to present six different petitions today. The first three petitions are on behalf of the hon. Member for Drumheller. These petitions are signed by approximately 196 Albertans from that constituency asking the government to deinsure abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act and to use community-based resources to promote positive alternatives to abortions.

Mr. Speaker, the next petition is signed by 412 members of the Catholic parish in St. Paul also asking the government to deinsure abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act.

The other two petitions are signed by approximately 119 Albertans from across the province urging the government "not to make sexual orientation a part of the Individual's Rights Protection Act."

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-West.

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present two petitions forwarded by concerned citizens from the Lethbridge-West constituency. First, I would like to present a petition signed by 432 individuals urging the government to

1. De-insure the performance of induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan Act.
2. Use the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion.

Secondly, I would like to present a petition signed by 5,245 individuals urging the government to assist in stopping the Chinook regional health authority from tearing down St. Michael's hospital and requesting that it be refurbished or rebuilt by 1995-96.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MRS. FORSYTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition today outlining the deinsuring of the performance of induced abortions under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act using the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion. This petition is from members of St. Bonaventure parish and Our Lady of Maria Bistrica church in Calgary, and it contains 1,223 signatures; 696 are from Calgary-Fish Creek.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert.

MRS. SOETAERT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have petitions signed by 756 people urging the Legislative Assembly to

1. De-insure the performance of induced abortion . . . and
2. Use the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion.

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

MR. DOERKSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present three petitions today. The first one has 23 signatures, and they are not in favour of deinsuring abortions.

I'd like to present two other petitions. One is from St. Vladimir's Ukrainian Catholic church in Red Deer, which requests the Assembly to deinsure the performance of induced abortion and use the community-based resources that are already in place, and it has 43 signatures, and one is from Sacred Heart Catholic church in Red Deer, a petition which contains 580 signatures, to "de-insure the performance of induced abortion" and use "community-based resources that are already in place."

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present three petitions from, respectively, Our Lady of Peace parish, Our Lady of the Assumption parish, and Our Lady of Perpetual Help parish, all on the same subject, signed by a total of 194 Albertans, and reading:

We the undersigned residents of Alberta petition the Legislative Assembly to

1. De-insure the performance of induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan Act.
2. Use the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present two petitions today. The first is from St. James parish in the Highwood constituency, with approximately 68 signatures asking the government to deinsure induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act and to use the community-based resources to promote positive alternatives to abortion.

The second petition is from St. Michael's parish, also in the Highwood constituency, signed by 384 residents of the Highwood area along with several signatures from Albertans who were visiting from throughout the province. This petition, Mr. Speaker, also asks the government to deinsure induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act and to use community-based resources to promote positive alternatives to abortion.

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

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present four petitions from my constituency, respectively from the Holy Trinity parish, the St. Gregory parish, the Tofield parish, and the Viking parish, signed by a total of 188 Albertans, and reading:

We the undersigned residents of Alberta petition the Legislative Assembly to

1. De-insure the performance of induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan Act.
2. Use the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present two petitions today on behalf of residents of Medicine Hat and area. The first petition is signed by 14 individuals urging the Legislative Assembly "to reduce the \$25.00 application fee to access government records . . . as legislated under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act."

The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by 138 individuals and urges the Legislative Assembly to

1. De-insure the performance of induced abortion under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan Act.
2. Use the community-based resources that are already in place that offer positive alternatives to abortion.

**head: Reading and Receiving Petitions**

**1:40**

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I'd request that the petition I presented with respect to the Wind Valley now be read and received.

THE CLERK:

We, the undersigned, call upon the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government to give legislative protection to Wind Valley by officially designating it an Ecological Reserve, and to not allow the Limestone Valley Resort development to proceed without a full Environmental Impact Assessment and Natural Resources Conservation Board hearing.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask that the petition I presented yesterday on health care be now read and received.

THE CLERK:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta, petition the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government to uphold the five basic principles upon which Medicare was built: accessibility, universality, portability, comprehensiveness, public administration.

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

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd request now that the petition that I presented yesterday protesting excessive freedom of information fees be now read and received, please.

THE CLERK:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta petition the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Alberta to reduce the \$25.00 application fee to access government records, to be more in line with the other provinces, as legislated under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act regulations.

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

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Standing Committee on Private Bills has had a certain Bill under consideration and wishes to report as follows: the committee recommends that Bill Pr. 7 proceed with some amendments. As part of this report I will be filing copies of the amendments proposed for this Bill. I request the concurrence of the Assembly in this recommendation.

THE SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in the report by the hon. member?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

**head: Notices of Motions**

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(2)(a) I give notice that tomorrow I will move that written questions stand and retain their places on the Order Paper with the exception of questions 241 and 242.

As well, I give notice that motions for returns appearing on the Order Paper stand and retain their places with the exception of Motion 243.

**head: Introduction of Bills**

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

**Bill 47**

**Vencap Equities Alberta Act Repeal Act**

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Vencap Equities Alberta Act Repeal Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 47 read a first time]

**head:           Tabling Returns and Reports**

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of openness and accountability I'd like to file some documents that have been requested. These types of tablings and filings will make the recent petition by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo redundant. All right. Here's what has been requested, and here's what I'm filing: a summary of the sales of ALCB properties, equipment, and leased premises including the list of ALCB-owned properties sold; the list of unsold ALCB properties; the original cost of the St. Albert ALCB warehouse; the list of the ALCB leases terminated, surrendered, or assigned; the list of Alberta Liquor Control Board land leases and ALCB-owned buildings sold; the list of ALCB prepaid leases sold; the list of ALCB leases sublet; and the realty fee summary of ALCB properties sold.

Number two is the executive summary of the Ernst & Young report on Alberta Lotteries security dated May 19, 1994, and an update of April 1995.

Number three is the list of the VLT retailers by location and number of VLTs therein.

Number four is Alberta Lotteries segmentation study report summaries.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, carrying on in the spirit of producing information, on October 11 during question period I indicated to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora that I would provide a list of the Deputy Minister of Health's speaking commitments agreed to prior to her accepting that position. I am pleased to file five copies of that list.

Also, Mr. Speaker, during question period on October 17 I undertook to provide the hon. Member for St. Albert with information on the committees active in Alberta Health. I am pleased to file with the Assembly two lists. The first is of those 42 committees currently active, 28 of which are legislative, or required by statute. The second is a list of health boards and committees that have been disestablished since 1992, numbering 48.

During yesterday's question period I offered the hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung the package in sequence of correspondence between the federal Minister of Health and myself since October 11, 1995, on the private clinics issue. I am pleased to file five copies of this material now.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am filing copies of an information bulletin issued today regarding Palliative Care Week, October 20 to 27, 1995. I am sure we all recognize the importance of palliative care in our aging society and the dedication of the workers and volunteers who work in this area.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm filing with the Assembly today a news release and the government's response to 13 of the Auditor General's 38 recommendations contained in his report dated '94-95, which he filed with the Assembly yesterday. I point out to all members of the Assembly that of these first 13 the government has accepted the recommendations, and my colleagues and I will respond to the remainder of the recommendations in December.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table five copies of Alberta Education's Results Report on the Three-year Business Plan for Education as well as five copies of a report entitled Financial and Statistical Report of Alberta School Jurisdictions.

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

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased today to table four copies of Fort Saskatchewan's seniors' health survey. This was undertaken by the Fort Saskatchewan Seniors' Advisory Board. There's very useful information. For example, 75 percent of respondents indicated they were affected a lot by provincial reductions in various health benefits.

Thank you.

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Speaker, further to the Justice minister's statement yesterday about his closed meeting on access enforcement held on July 25, 1995, I am pleased to table a summary of that very meeting prepared by a Marina Forbister, together with a list of promises the minister made to those in attendance.

Thank you.

**head:           Introduction of Guests**

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

MS HALEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you a gentleman from my constituency, Dr. Paul Ferris, who is the president of the Three Hills Prairie Bible Institute. Would you please rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

THE SPEAKER: The Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

MR. LANGEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly six adult students from the Kihew Asiniy school in Saddle Lake. They are accompanied today by their teacher Ms Gloria Gadacz. I would ask our guests to rise and receive a warm welcome from the Assembly.

1:50

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MR. HENRY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly 31 young people from one of my favourite spots in my constituency, Queen Mary Park school. They're accompanied by Miss Debbie Windwick, their teacher, as well as Debra Schweymaier, Liz Sawada, and Irene Lowe. I recently attended the school during Read-in Week and had a great afternoon reading with these very bright and eager young people. They're here today in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

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

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar it's a great pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you 15 precious students who are in the public gallery from Terrace Heights elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers or group leaders Mrs. Barnstead and Mrs. Doran. I would ask them to rise and receive the very, very warm welcome of our House.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert.

MRS. SOETAERT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of

the Assembly a group of seniors from my riding. Villeneuve and Calahoo are where they're from. If you'll allow me to name them: Elsie L'Hirondelle, Lillian Coyes, and Ellen Tarvis are neighbours of mine; Paul and Maren Majeau, Bill and Florence Soetaert, Theresa Kerckhof, Theeda Verbeek, Arvilla Majeau, Jane Layer, and my aunt Gladys Borle. The last couple are Albert and Rita Soetaert. They are my husband's grandparents, and in January they will be celebrating their 65th anniversary.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly the Deputy Minister of Health, Dr. Jane Fulton. I take this opportunity as it is the first time she has visited the Legislature in the gallery. Would you please give her a very warm welcome.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to rise and introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly Mr. Blaine Stainger, who is the chairman of the Beverly business association. This is a business revitalization zone. Also visiting with Blaine is his friend Tony Waller. They are seated in the members' gallery. I'd like them to stand at this time and receive the very warm welcome of this Chamber.

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

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly two wonderful community-minded residents of the constituency of Edmonton-Glenora. They've joined us today in the public gallery. I'd like to introduce Anne Paquin and Lesia Kozak. I'd ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert.

MRS. SOETAERT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please allow me a second introduction. In our gallery today is an exchange student from Japan staying in Stony Plain and Spruce Grove. She's sponsored by the Rotary Club members there, and her name is Miki Suginome. She is here with Collette Hartmetz, who is working part-time in my office. I would ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

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

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you. I have two introductions I'd like to make today. First, Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to all Members of the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the gracious Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar I would like to introduce her guests, a group of students from Terrace Heights school. They're seated in one of the two galleries. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, again to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly I'd like to introduce two young, ambitious persons who attend radio and TV arts at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, a place where I went for four years in all and a very fine educational facility. They're doing some filming here as a class project. They're in the public

gallery. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the House.

## head: Ministerial Statements

### 50th Anniversary of United Nations

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, October 24, 1945, 51 countries celebrated the coming into force of the United Nations Charter. Those countries represented visionaries with the foresight to see that the world was changing quickly and that the best future for the people of the world was through mutual concern, co-operation, and action.

As a Canadian I am proud to say that our country was one of the original 51 founding countries of the United Nations. At the time the charter was being drafted in San Francisco in the spring of 1945, the *New York Times* wrote: "When the chips were down, the Canadians fought harder and more effectively for the principle of collective security than anyone else." As an Albertan I am proud to mark this important anniversary in the Legislature and to have seen the United Nations flag flying on the Legislature today.

Over the half century of its existence the UN has grown from 51 primarily western countries to 184 member nations from every part of the globe. The purposes set out in the charter remain the same today as they were 50 years ago: to maintain international peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations based on the principle that all nations have equal rights and are entitled to self-determination, and to co-operate internationally in solving social, economic, cultural, and humanitarian problems.

Today the UN structure includes the 184-member General Assembly, the 15-member Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, the Secretariat, and the 54-member Economic and Social Council. These bodies oversee a vast array of work ranging from peacekeeping to surveys of international social and economic trends to the organization of international conferences.

Most Albertans are affected one way or another by United Nations activities. In a few days children will be collecting coins in the UNICEF boxes along with Halloween treats. The Canadian delegation to the recent World Conference on Women and the associated nongovernmental organization conference included a large number of dedicated Albertans. Many of us belong to organizations who have sponsored refugee families in our communities. Canada is one of the original signatories to the convention on the status of refugees. Albertans mark World Food Day with others around the world. International trade, whether under the rules of GATT or the WTO, which will replace it, affects the ways we produce and sell goods every day in this province. Alberta's doctors, nurses, and dentists have worked with the World Health Organization projects throughout the world. School students study the UN as part of their curriculum. There are hundreds of ways individual Albertans are involved in the United Nations.

Few Canadian contributions to the history and effectiveness of the UN are as well known as the peacekeeping movement. Lester B. Pearson won a Nobel prize for his involvement in developing peacekeeping forces. In particular, I'd like to recognize the sacrifices that our peacekeepers have made in order to serve the goals of the United Nations. Canadians have been a part of every single UN peacekeeping mission. Soldiers, nurses, doctors, RCMP members, and reservists from all over our province have dedicated up to a year at a time of their lives, sometimes risking and even losing their lives in the pursuit of greater international

peace and security. We owe them and their families an enormous thank you for their sacrifices.

The guests I introduced earlier today are representatives of the peacekeepers from Alberta who have served the cause of peace throughout the world. I would ask that we recognize the work of the Canadian Committee for the 50th Anniversary of the United Nations, chaired by Doug Roche and including Dr. Horst Schmid as Alberta's representative, in raising awareness of this important event. I hope all Albertans will take this opportunity to consider the contributions made by their friends, their neighbours, and themselves to the ongoing work of the UN and to think about how the United Nations can be made a stronger vehicle for international co-operation.

Thank you.

2:00

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

MR. DICKSON: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to thank the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for his initiative in recognizing this important anniversary. I particularly want to thank the special guests in your gallery for bringing home to everybody in this Chamber the importance of Alberta's and Canada's contributions to the work of the United Nations.

I particularly appreciated the comments of the hon. minister when he spoke of ways the United Nations affects Albertans and our lives today. What Canadian school student does not know of the enormous role played by Canada firstly in the formation of the United Nations and then in the early years the splendid work done by Mike Pearson and Charles Ritchie and the key intervention in the Suez crisis, really the initial peacekeeping effort for the United Nations? Of course, when representatives of Canada went to San Francisco in 1945 to develop the charter for the United Nations, they took with them the hope that the United Nations could do what the League of Nations had been unable to do; namely, to prevent war. As we all know all too well, that lofty goal has not been attained, yet most certainly this world is much better for the attempt.

While war has not been prevented, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations was instrumental in ending 172 regional conflicts since 1945. There are currently 16 different peacekeeping forces in operation in global trouble spots, and as we speak, there are some 70,000 troops engaged on behalf of the United Nations, many of them, I'm proud to say, Canadian.

Perhaps we tend to focus too much on the shortcomings of the United Nations and much too little on the unqualified successes. The World Health Organization and UNICEF have conducted a very successful immunization program. The World Bank has provided stability to economies of many developing nations. The world court and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees have demonstrated that there are some fundamental human freedoms and rights which take precedence over national sovereignty.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the work of local chapters of the United Nations Association in Canada. Their volunteer work in promoting the United Nations in education and the spirit of internationalism play an important role in our communities. I'm proud and my caucus is proud of the important work they do on behalf of all of us.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities.

### Canadian Airlines International

DR. WEST: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As part of a viable transportation industry in Alberta air service is a crucial component to support the Alberta advantage. It is my understanding that Canadian Airlines International is planning to make a recommendation to consolidate some of its services in Vancouver, British Columbia. Specifically, Canadian Airlines International is planning to amalgamate its heavy maintenance functions in one location. This will affect 441 jobs: 313 will be transferred from Calgary to Vancouver, and 128 positions will be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, while we don't want to be perceived as overseeing the management of Canadian Airlines International, I must say that I'm very, very disappointed by the direction the airline is taking at this time. This is an organization that has had a lot of support from the Alberta government. We believe strongly in ensuring that there is good domestic competition, and that is why we put our resources behind Canadian Airlines International.

As we all know, there are many advantages to doing business in Alberta. We have a highly skilled and trained workforce, the lowest tax rates in Canada, and are the only province without a sales tax. While I understand the need for Canadian Airlines to reduce costs in order to remain competitive, the government questions whether a proper comparison has been made of the costs of doing business in Alberta as opposed to British Columbia.

Canadian Airlines International is scheduled to take their recommendation to their board meeting on October 25, 1995. I urge board members, especially from Alberta, to seriously reconsider this direction. I hope they take with them the strong concerns of the Alberta government and the option of looking more closely at their proposed recommendations.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-West.

MR. DALLA-LONGA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are very sympathetic to the minister's concern for the jobs, the economic interests of the people of Calgary and of Alberta, notwithstanding the fact that this minister is single-handedly responsible for eliminating a job or two himself. But as this minister well knows, business has to be run by businesspeople and not by politicians.

The minister may feel that the government has some special right to tell Canadian Airlines how to run its business because of the loan guarantees made to that company, but I believe it has no such right. This government does have an obligation to try to persuade Canadian to not shut down its maintenance facilities and to save those jobs. In that regard this caucus totally supports that role and those efforts. In fact, our caucus is prepared to assist the government in whatever manner it can in urging Canadian to stay in Calgary and save those jobs as long as it means no more financial assistance.

Who knows, Mr. Speaker? As is often the case, maybe a way can be found to keep the maintenance facility open and to save those jobs. Maybe there is a way to solve the problem and there is possibly a way to get Canadian to stay in Calgary without providing additional financial assistance. That would be the true measure of good government and a true test of the ability of its leaders. It's too easy and usually counterproductive to throw government dollars at such a problem, and too often Albertans end up being the losers, the very people that we tried to help in the first place.

I'm sure Canadian has their reasons for their move, but that doesn't mean we can't help them, can't convince them to stay in a nonfinancial manner with no financial assistance. I'm sure that

they have carefully analyzed their position, but as elected representatives of this province, we can't give up.

Therefore in summary, Mr. Speaker, we support and applaud the minister in his concerns and his efforts, and we support him in principle. Our offer to assist him to try to persuade Canadian to retain its maintenance facility in Calgary stands.

Thank you.

**head: Oral Question Period**

**Special Waste Treatment Centre**

MR. MITCHELL: Swan Hills of course, Mr. Speaker, is a different story. This government, this Premier have argued that Albertans, whether they are on social assistance, whether they are nurses or physicians, teachers, or civil servants, are accountable for their actions. This Premier has held Albertans accountable for the \$33 billion provincial debt as he cuts health care and education expenditures, but he has never ever held his own government accountable for the mistakes they make. Now the Auditor General has found the Premier responsible for critical decisions leading to the loss of half a billion dollars on the Swan Hills waste treatment facility. To the Premier: does the Premier believe in the long-standing parliamentary tradition of ministerial accountability?

MR. KLEIN: The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is yes. All ministers are accountable, and all members of this government are accountable. The real test of accountability comes at election time.

MR. MITCHELL: To the Premier, who said he was at least partly responsible for the \$500 million loss in Swan Hills: could he tell us which part of the \$500 million was his responsibility? Was it \$100 million? Was it \$200 million? Was it maybe \$350 million or \$450 million, Mr. Speaker?

**2:10**

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the Auditor General made some recommendations relative to the way the Swan Hills deal originally came about in the early 1980s. He made some comment relative to the new agreement. He made some findings relative to the expansion of Swan Hills, and as a result of those findings he made some recommendations which we are very happy to accept.

One recommendation, Mr. Speaker:

It is recommended that the effect on three-year business plans of significant changes to major programs or capital expenditures be quantified before the changes are implemented. Changes should be measured in terms of their effect on the originally planned outputs and costs.

Mr. Speaker, he also recommended that

when proposed major programs or capital expenditures are dependent on future events, the minister responsible disclose in the entity's three-year business plan an evaluation of the downside risk to the plans proposed.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to also mention something that the Auditor General mentioned in his report, and that is something that this government did that he deemed to be very smart. He said: had the SPC process, the standing policy committee, been in place, had there been, as we now have, the requirement for three-year business plans, perhaps the decision relative to Swan Hills would have been different.

With respect to the specific question, I would also like to quote from the Auditor General's report, because they are trying to

leave the impression that this was a total 400 and some-odd million dollar loss. The Auditor General is not saying that at all. He never has said that in his report. As a matter of fact, I'm going to quote from the report, Mr. Speaker, because I think this is important. He said:

Some people have characterized the Swan Hills facility as a business venture, and its financial results as losses.

That's what the Liberals are trying to do, but here's what the Auditor General, an independent adjudicator, has to say.

I believe this is unfortunate because from the earliest days, most serious observers . . .

Not Liberals but serious observers.

. . . viewed the facility as a government program that was delivered in conjunction with a private sector partner.

MR. MITCHELL: So nobody's being held accountable, Mr. Speaker, by this Premier, who was directly involved in that fiasco. Nothing's changed.

Will the loss of a half a billion dollars on Swan Hills therefore be treated like NovAtel, like the Husky Oil upgrader, like Gainers, like MagCan, with not a single minister, not a single member of that government being held responsible for the half a billion dollars in taxpayers' money that's been lost? And the Premier was directly responsible for it.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Swan Hills plant dealt with some 70,000 tonnes of hazardous waste. I would ask the Liberal opposition: what would they have done with that waste? Would they have stored that waste someplace? Would they have tried to find someplace to ship it out of country? Would they have done as Quebec did very unsuccessfully: loaded up tonnes of PCBs and tried to get them to Wales, where the longshoremen refused to unload them so they were sent back to Quebec, then sent back to Wales, then sent back to Quebec at great expense, and finally unloaded in the then Prime Minister's constituency in Baie-Comeau? Is that the way they would have treated this?

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what the Auditor General said, and I'm going to repeat it so they understand this. I am quoting from the Auditor General's report.

Some people have characterized the Swan Hills facility as a business venture, and its financial results as losses. I believe this is unfortunate because from the earliest days, most serious observers viewed the facility as a government program that was delivered in conjunction with a private sector partner.

Indeed, in 1980 the Environment Council of Alberta "reported that Alberta needed a system for handling hazardous wastes safely," and we have done that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm reminded of the responses we used to receive from the Getty government about the NovAtel fiasco.

The Auditor General highlighted the Premier's flip-flop on oil field waste treatment at Swan Hills.

I am satisfied that had the government decided to exempt oilfield waste before October 1992, construction of the major expansion at Swan Hills would have been delayed.

Bovar was very, very happy that that decision to exempt was delayed beyond the decision to expand the plant. Will the Premier please confirm that he knew full well that treating oil field waste was essential to getting the go-ahead for the expansion of Swan Hills, but once permission was given and Bovar was happy, he then changed his mind so he could also keep the energy industry happy?

MR. KLEIN: It simply is not true. It was always my opinion that we ought not to artificially create waste and designate waste as hazardous that in fact is not hazardous, Mr. Speaker.

Relative to how this evolved in a regulatory sense, I would be very happy to have the hon. Minister of Energy supplement.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Energy.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think there is mass confusion on the opposition side, but that's not unexpected.

Mr. Speaker, clearly in the province of Alberta the oil and gas industry has been regulated for over 55 years by the former Energy Resources Conservation Board, today known as the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board. All regulations, including oil field waste, are regulated under that board and have been all along.

When the new Alberta environmental protection Act was being put in place with the NRCB, there was a determination that that process would continue. In fact, there was an upstream petroleum waste committee that was struck to determine what should be in line and what had to be classified as hazardous within the oil industry.

Clearly, so hon. members know, oil field waste is not all hazardous. Much of the waste that comes from oil field activities is in fact from down hole and is returned to its origin. Those items that are in fact deemed to be hazardous are going up to Swan Hills, but that is minimal. There's a lot of the waste, the majority of it, that actually goes back to the origin, which is down hole.

So please don't confuse the issue of overall classifying something that is hazardous that in fact is not. You do not fictitiously put a classification on something that is the normal process.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, while the Auditor General states that the Premier's decisions were strategic mistakes, will the Premier confirm that these were not mistakes at all, that they were calculated, planned, political decisions which clearly benefited Bovar at the huge expense of Alberta taxpayers?

MR. KLEIN: No. I will confirm no such thing, Mr. Speaker. All decisions that were made were made in the best interests of Albertans and in the best interest of protecting the environment. I always looked upon this plant as a utility, a utility to address a very specific problem.

I would like to again quote from the Auditor General's report. [interjections] They quote from the Auditor General's report quite extensively, so allow me to quote, and we will go back and forth.

2:20

These are not my words. These are the words of the Auditor General, and this is a reflection of my political attitude toward the Swan Hills plant. He says:

In many ways, the Swan Hills facility has achieved its intended program objectives. Alberta no longer has a PCB problem, a claim that few jurisdictions in North America can make . . . [This] facility has undoubtedly reduced significantly the health and environmental risks associated with the storage and spillage of hazardous wastes.

I think that is very significant. No other jurisdiction can make that claim.

MR. MITCHELL: Concerned about the environment; not particularly concerned about the health care system.

In light of the Auditor General's concerns and the stench of backroom dealings associated with the government's policy on oil field waste treatment, will he commit to a public inquiry to clear the air?

MR. KLEIN: Well, in fact we have had an independent inquiry into this, and I committed to do that. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, are they saying by their moans and groans that the Auditor General is not independent? Is that what you're telling me? Then stand up and say it right now. Stand up and say it right now. What I'm hearing them say, what I'm hearing the Liberals say is that they can't trust the Auditor General. Is that what they are saying?

I asked the Auditor General to conduct an independent adjudication of this particular circumstance, all the circumstances surrounding Swan Hills. I said that I would make myself available for any interviews or any investigation of this matter, which I did. The Provincial Treasurer made himself available. The minister of environment made himself available. The chairman of the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation made himself available.

So, Mr. Speaker, there has been an independent, honest adjudication of this situation. I'm willing to accept the findings, but I'm not willing – I am not willing – to accept in any way the suggestion of the Liberals that the Auditor General can't be trusted. [interjections]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The mystery surrounding the Premier's flip-flop on sending oil field waste to the Swan Hills plant involves not only the Premier but the former Deputy Premier, the Member for Barrhead-Westlock. The former Deputy Premier has said that this decision was a major reversal – in other words, a flip-flop – and he was on the losing side of that decision. Only a few days ago in this Assembly the member said that this major reversal was regrettable. To the Premier: since the Premier's flip-flop on oil field waste has cost Alberta taxpayers millions of dollars, can the Premier explain why in 1993 the former Deputy Premier's concerns about this flip-flop were completely ignored?

MR. KLEIN: Well, first of all there was no flipping; there was no flopping, Mr. Speaker. My position on this matter has always been that we ought not as a government to artificially create a waste stream just to feed the Swan Hills plant. If, indeed, the waste is not hazardous waste, it should not be regulated as defined as hazardous waste. I mean, where do you draw the line? Do you start designating Liberal communiqués as hazardous waste and designate that that should go to Swan Hills?

THE SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's so interesting that the Premier became righteous after he approved the expansion for Swan Hills.

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: will the Premier now admit that his former Deputy Premier was right all along, that the Premier's insistence on changing the rules was costly to taxpayers and indeed was very regrettable?

MR. KLEIN: I will agree that the hon. Member for Barrhead-Westlock has always had his opinions, and sometimes we haven't been in total agreement. Nonetheless, he's a tremendous MLA and has never been known as a person who doesn't speak his mind, and for that we appreciate him.

THE SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier: given that the former Deputy Premier and many others will have a story to tell about the Premier's costly flip-flop and that the Auditor General says the question on oil field waste is the question he found most difficult to answer, why won't the Premier, the open and accountable Premier, agree to a public inquiry on that decision?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, there was no flip-flopping on this particular issue. I have said before my . . .

MR. COLLINGWOOD: We thought you were the minister of environment.

MR. KLEIN: That's right and I was. My opinion on this particular matter – that is my opinion, and I was the minister at that particular time – was that we ought not to artificially create waste streams just to feed the plant, that it would set dangerous precedents.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Energy pointed out, very little oil field waste is hazardous waste. There are other ways of treating oil . . . [interjections]

THE SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the hon. members to visit facilities in places like Big Valley, in places like Ryley, Alberta, numerous landfill operations that are environmentally sound and are monitored very carefully by Environmental Protection. There are all kinds of facilities in this province that can handle at far less cost oil field wastes that are not hazardous.

THE SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

### Quebec Referendum

MRS. FORSYTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier. From recent reports it appears that the referendum campaign in Quebec is too close to call. I am concerned about the future of this country. [applause] Thank you.

For the record, could the Premier please outline the government of Alberta's position with respect to the question being put to the people of Quebec? Specifically, is it about negotiation or separation?

2:30

MR. KLEIN: Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, this question is about separation. I believe that the question is purposely vague, but the preamble to the Bill is not. This referendum is about Bill 1 in the Quebec National Assembly, An Act Respecting the Future of Quebec, which states very clearly in the preamble – and I quote because this is very important – “We the people of Québec, through our National Assembly, proclaim: Québec is a sovereign country.” What could be clearer than that? The resolution

doesn't quite put it that way. The resolution is quite vague, but the preamble says, “Québec is a sovereign country.” We urge the people of Quebec to vote no.

Quebec brings some very special strengths to Canada and has since the beginning of Canada. And Quebec was the first part of Canada. It brings economic strength. It brings strength in the area of the beautiful French language. It brings strength in culture. It brings strength in tradition. I think that Albertans generally recognize those strengths and generally have great appreciation for the people of Quebec and those strengths that I just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very special relationships that exist between Alberta and Quebec that exist nowhere else. I had the very great honour of being the mayor of Calgary when we had our twinning relationship with Quebec City, and it was just a marvelous relationship where we could have exchanges of teachers and students and economic exchanges and where I would attend the Carnaval and they would send delegations to participate in the Stampede. The city of Edmonton has a very strong relationship with the city of Hull where similar kinds of exchanges take place.

We have been together with Quebec on a number of issues. We have worked hard with Quebec on workforce retraining to break down the overlapping and duplication. We have worked hard with Quebec on the harmonization of environmental legislation and on energy. There are a number of areas of common interest. I would like to say to the people of Quebec that within the existing framework of federation we will as a province continue to work with Quebec to achieve those things that are for the common good of both provinces. We're saying to the people of Quebec: “Stay with us. It's a great country, and it's made even greater by your presence.”

Mr. Speaker, I would request the unanimous consent of the Assembly for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to supplement my answer.

THE SPEAKER: Is there consent in the Assembly to allow this procedure?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE SPEAKER: Opposed? Unanimous consent.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly for the unanimous consent to allow me to participate in this short statement.

I would like to begin by saying to the Premier that I appreciate greatly and I congratulate him on the responsible and cautious manner in which he has approached this issue. I think it is very, very becoming and very important that we do that in this kind of circumstance.

I would like to take a slightly different approach from the Premier's in my comments and talk about this in a more personal context. I am Canadian, Mr. Speaker. By the very grace of God I have been born into a country where I have experienced safety and security, opportunity and prosperity, freedom and fairness like people across the world can hardly even imagine in many, many places. By virtue of being Canadian parents, Teresa and I have been able to raise our boys – Lucas, Liam, and Grady – with a confidence about their well-being and with a sense of security about their future that parents across the world can hardly even imagine in the way that we have it here.

One of the real treasures about being Canadian is that we can express ourselves as individuals. We can pursue and enhance our personal cultural heritages, and at the same time we can gain the strength that we all gain by working together as Canadians. Quebec has been an important part of the strength of this country.

Canada is a resilient country. Canada is a country that has evolved, that has changed with changing demands. If we simply give her a chance to do that again, I know that she is capable of doing that again in the future.

In the very reaches of my heart, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to lose this country, and I know that every Albertan does not want to lose this country. I hope and I pray that the people of Quebec can find it in their hearts to decide to stay. If we can send a single, important, and powerful message to Quebec, let it be: together we are stronger; c'est mieux ensemble.

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

### Special Waste Treatment Centre (continued)

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, what do you say to the Auditor General's report when he says specifically on page 45:

Both the Corporation and Chem-Security have also indicated that the expectation of increased oilfield waste was based on assurances from the Department of Environmental Protection.

Your department.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, what I'm reading here is that there was an expectation.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Is that because you wrote the draft regulations?

MR. KLEIN: No.

There might have been an expectation, Mr. Speaker, but my attitude – and that was passed on to my officials in the department – was that we ought not to create artificially a waste stream just for the sake of feeding Swan Hills. There might have been expectations, but they weren't mine.

DR. PERCY: Given the parliamentary tradition of ministerial accountability, how can a department go in one direction and the minister go in another?

MR. KLEIN: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it's really quite easy, because the minister is ultimately in charge. Unfortunately, these people will never find out how it works.

DR. PERCY: Again, Mr. Speaker, given the tradition of ministerial accountability, when a department goes one way and sends out an expectation and the minister in fact says that that's not the case and we have a multimillion-dollar investment undertaken, who's responsible?

MR. KLEIN: As I say, Mr. Speaker, there may have been those expectations, but it was never my attitude, and it was never my opinion that that indeed should happen.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Show some backbone.

MR. KLEIN: I'm showing all the backbone . . . [interjections] What would you like me to do? Turn around and take off my shirt? You'll see my backbone. Right?

Mr. Speaker, it never was my attitude or my opinion that this waste should be designated hazardous waste just to create a waste stream. There may have been those expectations. The Auditor General points out that there were some expectations, but I made it quite clear as the minister that in my opinion this was not an advisable or the proper thing to do.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. chairman wishes to augment.

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud is conveniently ignoring one of the Auditor General's comments on page 44 of the report, wherein he indicates:

I am satisfied that the NRCB based its approval of the expansion project on the assumption that the waste stream forecasts were not dependant on a change in the regulations.

That's very important from the government's perspective in that there was no expectation with the NRCB that the regulations would be changed. Therefore they felt, Mr. Speaker, that the existing waste streams were sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded facility.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

### 2:40

### Doctors' Fees

MR. LANGEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Auditor General's report points out that the doctors' current "fee for service payment system appears to contain no obvious strategy to promote more cost-effective services" or to eliminate unnecessary billings. The system gives financial incentives based on visits rather than on promoting lifestyles for Albertans. This system makes it more attractive for doctors to remain in large urban centres because of the potential of more visits. My question is to the Minister of Health. How does this comment from the Auditor General fit your department's plan to reshape Alberta's health system?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, frankly I agree with the Auditor General's comments. The fee-for-service system is not the most effective way to reimburse physicians in all circumstances, and I think that's the important comment. It shouldn't but can in some ways promote overutilization. However, we must not forget that it also can promote productivity. I think the important point is that perhaps the one system or another is not right, but perhaps a blend of systems might work. Perhaps the salaried physicians work better in primary care, but you may need a different system in specialties.

Mr. Speaker, we take this so seriously and think it's an extremely important matter in Alberta not only for distribution of physicians but to ensure that the physicians in this province are properly compensated for the services that they provide. We take it so seriously that we have asked the AMA to work with us to find a compensation methodology for physicians in this province that will meet the physicians' needs and, most importantly, meet the citizens' needs.

THE SPEAKER: Supplemental question, the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

MR. LANGEVIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Again to the same minister. Because the Auditor says that to be cost-efficient "different funding systems are required in the preventive, treatment and palliative care components of health care," how do you plan to address this concern?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, we have addressed some of the areas of palliative care. I would point out that with cancer patients, which are quite often in that area, we have oncologists that work with the Cancer Board that are salaried. They're on a sessional basis, not on a fee-for-service basis. We do recognize that persons who are in end-stage illnesses might require a great deal of time that can't be divided up into individual services.

Certainly this points out some of the problems that we have. For example, if a physician has a group of patients that are diabetic and it would be better to bring them into a group session, there is no fee that meets that need. A physician has to meet them on an individual basis covered under the fee-for-service model. Right now a physician speaking on the phone to a patient can't bill that through our plan.

I think what these do point out is the need for us to sit down with the physicians in this province through their association and work out those areas. So we're committed to doing that, Mr. Speaker. The AMA and ourselves have had some discussions. There have been papers prepared for the deputy ministers of Health in the province and one that was just prepared for the ministers' meetings in September.

MR. LANGEVIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health: what incentive or plan would you have to attract sufficient doctors to rural Alberta?

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, again, we have been working very aggressively through the rural physician action plan in this province. Certainly the distribution problem in this province does point out the fact that we must address the concerns of lack of physician services in rural communities. I think that has to be an important part of physician resource management, and I have challenged the AMA to work with us to find a way to ensure that we have the proper mix of physicians in this province and distributed in a way that meets the citizens' needs. I will be pressing the AMA very hard to work with us. We believe that a co-operative solution to this question is a better one than an arbitrary one.

### Special Waste Treatment Centre

*(continued)*

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Speaker, the Bovar deal is Alberta's worst economic fiasco to date. The tragedy is that it is not over yet. You know, this government has agreed to do the following things. They've contracted the right to invest more, they've guaranteed insurance, they've guaranteed cleanup, and they've guaranteed site inspections, all without a business plan of the risk and all contrary to the Auditor General's recommendation, which the Treasurer today accepted. So my question to the Premier, then, is this: Mr. Premier, in the absence of the risk assessment of the future obligations out of this toxic mess, why would you have committed your government to these future liabilities?

MR. KLEIN: I'm sorry; the hon. member is talking about a toxic mess? Can you imagine the toxic mess we would have in this province had we not had Swan Hills? That would have been a

toxic mess. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed that this member coming from Fort McMurray – you know, where a lot of the waste goes to Swan Hills – would not be standing up and defending this facility, because it has made his community environmentally sound.

MR. GERMAIN: Will you at least, Mr. Premier, direct the Provincial Treasurer to include in next year's budget the liabilities, quantified in a dollar, economic way and presented in that budget?

MR. KLEIN: Well, I don't know; right? Well, maybe you could ask – I mean, I've got no problems if the Provincial Treasurer has no problems. Do you?

MR. DINNING: I haven't any problems. I have no problems.

MR. KLEIN: Okay. Maybe you would like to stand up and supplement.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General in the past has mused about the cost, the contingent liability associated with cleaning up the environmental aspects of plants like this. What has happened – and I would take some advice from the accounting profession and certainly from the University of Alberta business school, including the accounting department, and the economics faculty of course as well as to how you would properly put that on the financial statements of the province. Clearly that contingent liability is there, but on the advice of the accounting profession we would want to make sure that there is adequate disclosure so that Albertans know the facts, just as they do from having read the Auditor General's report.

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Premier, will you undertake to table in this Legislative Assembly all reports that your government has now that indicate what the economic future costs to Albertans of this plant will be?

MR. KLEIN: I will have the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw supplement, who's chairman of the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation, but I have no problems in tabling with this Legislature, provided that the Liberal opposition gives me a reasonable amount of time, all the information that we possibly can.

MRS. SOETAERT: Before the next election.

MR. KLEIN: It'll be done before the next election; right.

You know, fundamental to this question – and the Liberals fail to point this out – it was me who asked for the report. You know, because I wasn't afraid, I asked for the report, Mr. Speaker. I wrote the letter.

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

**2:50**

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, to agree with the Premier, we will table any and all reports that we generate.

I would like to comment with respect to the remediation issue. We have actually put into the consolidated financial statements of the Special Waste Management Corporation a provision for \$7.5 million to take care of that future remediation that was done on a

net present value basis. The total was estimated at anywhere from \$31 million to \$52 million to reclaim the site.

Mr. Speaker, as concerns the insurance that was mentioned by the hon. Member for Fort McMurray, that is an issue that we will be dealing with during the phase 2 negotiations. I would also mention that with the cell maintenance and remediation, we are looking at receiving out of this transaction approximately \$1 million to offset those costs. Certainly I have no problem at all in disclosing to this House and certainly to the hon. member whatever he might need in order to evaluate the future liabilities.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

### Prisoner Work Crews

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you. My questions are to the Minister of Justice. Several months ago the Minister of Justice spoke publicly about the idea of chain gangs in Alberta. This morning there was a report in the people's newspaper about chain gangs. To the Minister of Justice: when do you expect to announce the approval and initiation of this project?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. member. As he is aware, through our processes in government with standing policy committees and with cabinet and caucus it does take some time to bring forward initiatives, but from the sound of his question, it sounds to me like he is lending some support to this initiative, and I'll look forward to his continued support.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Is there any community demand for this inexpensive source of labour?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the reason that I am moving forward on this initiative. Currently we have over 330 minimum security prisoners who are providing very valuable service out in Alberta, in the urban and rural areas. They're providing service by cleaning up our roadways. They're providing service to communities, to other government departments, to seniors' organizations, and to nonprofit organizations. In fact, last year we had about 1.4 million hours of volunteer work done by these inmates, and at \$4.00 an hour that's about \$5.6 million.

Now, in fact, Mr. Speaker, what's happened is that we have more demand than we have minimum security inmates to fulfill that demand. So what I am considering doing is moving into a system where we will also have medium security prisoners involved in our road crews so that we can move more of our minimum security people into the community service work.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Because these are medium security volunteers, will the guards be armed, and how will public security be assured?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an important issue. These are medium security people. They are more of a threat to society so, number one, we have to identify areas where they will have very little contact with the average Albertan. That's why I'm thinking of this in the context of the road crews that are working around the province now. We have to ensure that we have security out with these crews, because the protection of law-abiding citizens is job one. So presumably those who will be out with these crews will be armed, and the appropri-

ate warning will be given to the inmates in the event that they should escape – and I don't think that's possible, certainly with the use of chains – but if they do escape, they will know very well that the officers who are on duty have weapons.

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

### Special Waste Treatment Centre

*(continued)*

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Provincial Treasurer. The Alberta taxpayers lost about half a billion dollars on the Swan Hills waste treatment facility, yet on the other hand Bovar has received a guaranteed return of almost \$63 million. In fact, the average return on equity was 18 and a half percent, and that profit was taken on borrowed money guaranteed by the provincial government. Can the Treasurer explain why Bovar was paid a risk premium on their profits when in fact there was absolutely no risk because of the guarantee from the province?

MR. DINNING: I know that I could call on my colleague the Member for Calgary-Shaw and chairman of the corporation to supplement my answer. Let me just respond by reminding the hon. member that some \$440 million was spent on this program, Mr. Speaker, to incinerate 70,000 tonnes of hazardous waste – \$440 million over a period of almost 10 years – when the city of Edmonton spent over that same period of time approximately \$396 million to get rid of their garbage and probably the city of Calgary spent a similar amount to eliminate garbage in the city of Calgary.

So for the member across the way to characterize this project, this program to eliminate, to incinerate hazardous waste and to call it a business venture flies in the face of what the Auditor General said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when he said:

Most serious observers viewed the facility as a government program that was delivered in conjunction with a private sector partner.

A wise decision because today, as the Auditor General says, this is a PCB-free province, something that no other jurisdiction in North America is able to say with conviction.

I would ask the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, however, to supplement my answer, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We must keep in mind under what conditions the original agreement was negotiated. This was at a time when we had a significant amount of PCBs, PCBs stored in this province. There was some concern as to whether or not the waste stream generated by those waste generators in the province would actually be sufficient in order to meet the demands of the facility. It was really, quite frankly, a high-risk venture. There were discussions with the private sector. They did go through a rather extensive public process in order to acquire a private-sector partner.

Whether we like it or not, what happened is that the waste streams did not materialize over the long term. Nevertheless, the government of the day I think made the right decision to proceed because, as the Provincial Treasurer indicated, we are PCB free at this point in time. He has indicated that, yes, disposing of your waste comes with a price. The Auditor General stated: could we have paid less? No question, Mr. Speaker, we could have;

nevertheless, it's very difficult to forecast these types of waste streams, and that in fact is one of the reasons why we're looking at renegotiating our present arrangement with Bovar.

MR. N. TAYLOR: It's the PCs that are the problem, not the PCBs.

THE SPEAKER: Order. The hon. Member for Calgary-North West has the floor, hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess through all that, the answer is that there is no explanation.

I'll try one more time to either one of those two hon. members. Is there an explanation why it is that, according to the Auditor General – and I want to read this so I can quote it – “throughout the four and a half years of negotiating, the Province's negotiators continually surrendered their bargaining positions”? Why did they do that?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. Premier commented on that yesterday. Part of our dilemma was that we had made the clear decision that we wanted the private sector to be involved in this plant and that it was not something that we felt we wanted to be in as a government over the long haul. Our objective was to get out of this project over a period of time. It didn't seem to make sense and we didn't believe that Albertans would buy this bill of goods that in order to get all the way out, we had to get all the way in first. For that reason we made the choice to go with the private-sector partner in the belief that in the longer term the taxpayer, through the province, would not be on the hook for this plant, and it is for that reason that the private sector was involved all the way throughout.

THE SPEAKER: Final supplemental.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final supplemental. Why did the government allow this, in the words of the Premier, utility, this plant expansion to be, first of all, overbuilt and then operated inefficiently while knowing that with the government guarantee, the more dollars that Bovar spent, the bigger their profits from the government?

**3:00**

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Calgary-Shaw may want to supplement my answer, but as I recall, it was on the advice of the Natural Resources Conservation Board that the government authorized this to proceed. The NRCB had done its due diligence, had taken submissions from a number of Albertans, and had come to the conclusion that this was the right way to go.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Calgary-Shaw would want to supplement the answer.

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

MR. HAVELOCK: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could refer the hon. member to page 37 of the Auditor General's report again to set the scene. When the expansion was being discussed, there was a backlog of waste requiring treatment of approximately 45,000 tonnes, and we were generating approximately 15,000 tonnes per year. The Swan Hills facility could over time eventually get rid of that backlog; however, there was an environmental

hazard and risk with respect to storing this for such an extended period of time. The decision was made to go ahead and expand the facility in order to eliminate the backlog. It was admitted at the time that it was likely that the waste stream generated within this province would not be sufficient in order to have that facility operating at full capacity after expansion. Nevertheless, it was to eliminate that backlog at the time, and it was also, as indicated earlier, based on the NRCB's recommendation that there was no need to change the oil field waste regulations. It was felt there was sufficient waste in the province in order to ensure the plant was financially viable.

THE SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Minister of Health has indicated to the Chair that she wishes to provide some supplementary information for an answer that she made yesterday that needs clarification.

### Prescription Drugs

MRS. McCLELLAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On October 12 actually I answered a question – I think it was on the 12th – from the Member for Calgary-Currie and indicated that “Pharmacists have launched an awareness campaign: Knowledge Is the Best Medicine.” I would like to correct that information.\* Indeed the Knowledge Is the Best Medicine campaign has been launched, but it has been launched by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada. They are working very closely with providers on the ongoing development of that. Because I think it's important to recognize that the pharmaceutical manufacturers are very interested in education in that area, I wanted to correct that.

Thank you for that, Mr. Speaker.

### head: Members' Statements

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

### Catholic School System

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government has been instituting massive changes to the education system, especially with respect to Catholic education. The government now finds itself in court with the Calgary Catholic school board defending the 1901 Ordinance, which allows Catholics to only teach their faith for one-half hour per day.

In fact, the teaching of the Catholic faith is done throughout the day and across the entire curriculum. Catholic teaching is a philosophy and a way of life that is more than just an academic study that can be completed at the end of the school day. It involves a Christian attitude that affects how people respond to issues in the sciences, language skills, and social sciences, not just in religion class. To deny Catholics this religious freedom to teach as they see fit is to deny the essence of catholicity and is in direct contradiction of rights given to Catholics in amendments to the School Act in 1988.

In addition to this major issue there is still the concern about governance regarding tax dollars. Catholics want the right to levy, collect, and spend the tax dollars of Catholic school supporters as they see fit. This is not just an issue of whether money flows to schools and school boards but one of control of those dollars. In particular, couples in a mixed-faith marriage will see their tax dollars split rather than going towards the system their children attend. Parents want to send their tax dollars to support their child in their school. The question that one must ask

\*See page 1918, left col., para. 9

is: who is asking for these changes? Certainly not the Catholics, who oppose the changes, nor is there any outcry from non-Catholics.

When a government acts in such a callous and hard-hearted manner, it leads one to question what happened to the supposedly caring and listening government that was supposed to be the mark of this Premier.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

#### **Elder Abuse**

MRS. BURGNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in this session a document was tabled, the demonstration project to address the issues of violence in older families. This was undertaken at the request of the family violence prevention division of Health Canada, and it was worked through the Kerby Centre. It is known as Synergy II.

Mr. Speaker, over the past decade the plight of older people involved in violent family relationships has emerged as a significant part of the total family violence issue. The purpose of the Synergy II project was to develop a comprehensive, practical, and inexpensive service delivery model useful for frontline workers across the country, and the purpose was to be achieved through collaboration with community resources.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this report, there were several objectives: to publicize services that were offered, to identify treatment, to look at training and consultation services to frontline workers, to collect information and evaluate it. The issue of elder abuse is significant in our society, and we need the factual data to allow us to develop appropriate programs.

A number of recommendations were developed, and these include the continued involvement of the community professionals through a consultation team, and this is at the hallmark of this particular report: the use of the community and this consultation team. We also would like to recognize that the advertising should continue in order to promote to the public the resources available at the Kerby Centre, as this particular study was centred in the Calgary community, to continue educational programs aimed at maintaining public awareness of their services and also of the types of abuse, and to include comprehensive peer training and counseling and refresher programs for those helping the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on the fact that many seniors do not read or understand English, and therefore brochures and information on resources available must be considered for translation and publication. We must also look at some of the data that was identified in that the majority of those abused were seniors who were not isolated from their community but in fact were having difficulty with their own family members and caregivers, a significant factor as we develop policies and concerns about them.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to this in my member's statement in order to put the issue in front of this Assembly so that as we deal with seniors and their needs in the community, this information is available to them.

Thank you.

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

#### **Hospital Services**

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. September 21 marked the passing of one of our pioneers of Alberta. She was 78 years old. She was a good wife, mother, and grandmother. In her

eulogy she was said not to be a leader but a helper. She was a pioneer. She lived in a time before we had medicare, and when Canada finally made this step to universal health care, she felt truly blessed to live in this province.

Tragically, this woman might be called one of those who fell through the cracks. On Friday, September 8, she was taken to the Misericordia hospital because she was so weak from what seemed like the flu that she could not stand up. She was sent home. The next day, as she was getting out of bed, she fell and broke a bone in her shoulder. Finally she was admitted to the hospital, a bit later I would think. On September 11 she was sent to the U of A hospital for a brain scan and then sent back to the Misericordia hospital. Do you know how uncomfortable it is to travel when you have a broken bone in your shoulder? Then on September 14 she was taken to the U of A hospital to be put in intensive care, but because she wasn't going to be put on a life-support system, she went back to the Misericordia. She died on September 21.

Did she fall through the cracks? Yes. Should she have been put in the hospital the first time she went in? Yes. Did she suffer needlessly as she was shuffled about the city because so many hospitals have been pared down too much? Yes. Why do loved ones have to die before this government realizes that they have gone too far?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a nameless person. This woman has relatives here in the gallery, and her niece is sitting in this House. Her name is Aline Soetaert, and she is sadly missed.

THE SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Fort McMurray indicated that he wishes to pursue a point of order at this time.

#### **Point of Order Brevity**

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is under *Beauchesne* 417 and arose out of the hon. Premier's first answer to the first question today. By way of background and to refresh the Speaker's attention to the details of this, the Premier was asked a very short question, and the short question was: how much of the Bovar loss are you responsible for? This was a natural question for an opposition leader to ask in this Legislative Assembly because the Premier admitted last night that he indeed had caused some of the loss of this particular plant. What we then had was a romp through the Auditor General's report, quoting extensively, talking about the policy of waste removal in the province of Alberta, talking about everything except the very short question that was asked, and the short question that was asked was: how much?

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, flows from the fact that I could sense from the Chair a certain anxiety at the length of time this answer was taking as well. I felt that it would be appropriate for a formalized ruling on this issue, which was in fact a very long, long answer to a very, very short question. Now, the Speaker is a legally trained member of the legal community and often knows what characterization people arrive at when they get very long answers to very short questions.

Thank you.

#### **3:10**

THE SPEAKER: Well, sometimes short questions can nevertheless be broad in their implications, and I think it's instructive to note that every single question proposed by the opposition caucus today was on one subject; namely, the question of the Swan Hills

hazardous waste plant. Therefore, at least in the minds of the opposition caucus, this area needed to be ventilated in great depth.

The hon. member is quite correct; the Chair was trying to give some signals that perhaps the answer could be more brief than it was. But it's a very difficult result to achieve, hon. member. In this particular case it seemed that there was a desire from a large part of the Assembly that time be spent on this subject, and I guess the hon. Premier was attempting to give as much information to the House as he felt capable of doing. Perhaps it could have been done more shortly, but maybe the whole effort could have been done with less time. It's hard for the Chair to know; it's really up to the Assembly.

Of course, the Chair would also point out that answers could be given more quickly if there wasn't a large amount of background noise in the Chamber at the same time. Sometimes it might be a better tactic to be quiet. It might put more focus on the person answering the question. Nevertheless, it's not up to the Chair to tell everybody exactly how they're to behave in here.

The Chair is not prepared to find a point of order that could be readily solved by some ruling. The Chair would just urge all hon. members – they're all aware of what *Beauchesne* says – to try to follow the guidelines set out in that admirable book.

Thank you.

**head: Orders of the Day**

**head: Public Bills and Orders Other than**

**head: Government Bills and Orders**

**head: Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: I call the committee to order.

### Bill 212

#### Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1995

THE CHAIRMAN: As committee members may recall, we were at the point of voting on the amendments when it was drawn to our attention that there had been a committee agreement. The agreement was to discuss them all at once but that we would vote on them one at a time. I presume that's why the hon. Member for Red Deer-South was rising, to draw our attention to that, as was Redwater.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I wished to speak on the Bill in general, not on this specific amendment, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're just voting on the amendments right now. We have, then, the first part of the series. We have section A, section B, section C, and section D, which referred to the list of amendments but not to the sections within the Bill. With that in mind, then, hopefully we're ready to begin the vote on the amendments, as we had agreed last day.

[Motion on amendments A, B, C, D carried]

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. Member for Redwater indicated that he wished to speak on the Bill itself as amended.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Yes. I just wanted to first of all thank the Member for Red Deer-South for bringing this in. I agree it cuts across Liberal and Conservatives. Our caucus certainly wasn't in full agreement with everything he brought up.

I wanted, Mr. Chairman, if I could, to take a moment. This is the Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act. I'm not sure this falls under that, but maybe the minister in charge of administering this would be able to answer it, if I'm right. I noticed one thing this summer when I traveled through the northwest U.S. They had one law that I thought was very good in Washington. All of us have progressed, particularly in the summer, on two-lane paved roads back through the forest and that, and because it's summer and the weather is fine and the people are enjoying the air and the trees look lovely, long lineups form, huge lineups that go snaking along over hill and dale. Unfortunately, usually somebody from Alberta up in the front with a motor home or one with a trailer might well be holding it up.

One of the rules that I noticed in Washington, that had signs beside the road – and I actually saw one or two people pulled over for it, because it's so very easy to administer – was that if you have more than five people behind you, you have to pull over. In other words, it's automatically concluded that you're going too slow for the traffic. It's very easy, of course. I think it does two things. Not only is it a rule that certainly speeds up flow and gets these hazards off the road as they're busy taking pictures of the bears and counting the leaves on the trees and so on. It gets them off to the side.

Also, I think it's an education process, because I actually believe in my heart that there's a good many people, certainly in Alberta, that blissfully think that once they're on the road, it doesn't matter how many are behind them. They got there first, so there's no thought of any education. So I think just a sign beside the road was an amazing education, because it said: look, if there's more than five behind you – it didn't say get off – pull off. It's extraordinarily easy to administer. Any policeman sitting in a car on a hill can look down over the valley and count them. It's only in winding and hilly country that it amounts to anything, where they can't pass. So I just wanted to throw that in.

3:20

Hopefully next year when Red Deer-South is looking for other amendments around this area, maybe the minister – I don't know whether it would fit under this or not – might take it under consideration, because it was well received. Everyone I talked to liked it; I found that as a tourist going through. I think it was a great safety gimmick too, because the worst thing that can happen is long lineups of six, eight, 10 cars; people start getting too impatient and try to pass.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for . . . Well, I've got three or four people indicating to me that they wish to stand. I would invite the hon. Member for Red Deer-South to speak if he wishes at this time, and then I'll recognize the minister or Edmonton-Centre.

MR. DOERKSEN: You can go with Edmonton-Centre. I was just going to ask for the question, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in fact, hon. member, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs caught the Chairman's eye before Edmonton-Centre did. So we'll ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs to speak to this Bill.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There were some very interesting suggestions that came forward from the hon. Member for Redwater. He would be better advised, though, to

talk to the minister of transportation. Maybe some of this could be amalgamated in the highway safety Act, in some of the safety regulations that govern that. It is an interesting phenomenon that happens not only down in the States but here. Certainly a sign to remind people of what they're doing would be advantageous, to say the least.

Back to the Bill, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated the other day, I'm not opposed to doing something with the drivers' licences and the learners' licences and the testing program in this province. I just think that this Bill is flawed in that it doesn't do the things that it set out to do. For instance – and I mentioned it the other day, but I think it bears repeating – you have an indication that a person must have a learner's permit for a period of one year. There is no way to actually validate whether that person ever drove that car or any other vehicle during that year. They could put that learner's permit in the dresser drawer and go back in a year's time and go and pass the test if they were so inclined and if they had enough knowledge to do it. I think the secret of this lies in the ability to somehow prove that you have in fact driven a car a certain number of hours or a certain period of time to actually gain the skills that you need to have to pass a test.

I further believe that we need to look at various aspects of this. The Insurance Bureau has come out very strongly in favour of this Bill. Again I ask the question: what has the Insurance Bureau done to initiate incentives for young people to be careful drivers and be good drivers? We're only talking about a small percentage of these young people. Again, as I mentioned the other day, I have a great deal of faith in our young people. A lot of them are excellent drivers. There is the odd one that gets mixed up with alcohol and maybe doesn't have the skills necessary, but the alcohol factor is not unique to the young people. There are lots of adults over the age of 18, in fact over the age of 40, that get involved with alcohol and driving at the same time. How do we prevent these things?

Mr. Chairman, I would rather see us go back and deal with the issues. We know now that we can't test zero percent alcohol. Anybody under 18 is not supposed to be drinking anyway, and I know it's not enforced to that extent in some areas. The fact of the matter is that if that's what we mean, that we want to test zero percent alcohol, then we need to make a large expenditure on new equipment, more technologically correct equipment that can actually do that. I would like to go back, as I've said before, and deal with the stakeholders and with the hon. Member for Red Deer-South, talk to all of the stakeholders, including the RCMP and city police, in this province and the other upholders of the law, the Justice department, and the people in my department who carry out some of the testing.

Now, we've recently undertaken in my department to deregulate driver training because we've checked statistics, all of the ones that we can get a hold of, and there is absolutely no indication that somebody that was trained in an accredited driving school is any better driver or has less accidents or gets involved in less commotion than the person who was taught to drive by their dad or their uncle or somebody out on the farm or husband or wife, in some cases. So we're in the process of deregulating that because there's no proof that you need to have an accredited driver trainer in order to train somebody to drive a vehicle. I know from my own experience and from my neighbours' experience that a lot of young people learn to drive on the farm, and they do so very well. They're driving tractors when they're seven, eight, nine, 10 years old, and they learn the mechanics and how to operate it.

The curfew that is asked for in this Bill 212 is absolutely unenforceable, as I've been told by the law enforcement officers that I've talked to. They said, "Why put something in place that's

unenforceable?" They've offered on many occasions and I've agreed with them that if we're doing legislation like this, we should sit down together before the fact rather than after the fact. With that type of a process you get good legislation if it's needed, and we deal with the actual problem instead of a supposed problem.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we defeat this Bill, with a general commitment from myself that we would be prepared to go back and talk to all of the stakeholders and come forward in the next session with some reasonable legislation that would in fact meet the needs of the police forces and help cut the carnage on the roads in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre has one minute, and then we'll interrupt him.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to speak briefly to Bill 212. I daresay the record here would show that the hon. Member for Red Deer-South and I have had several disagreements in this House, but this is one I think we'll find agreement on, and I want to compliment him on bringing this Bill forward.

I think a lot of what the other members have said certainly applies. Driving is a privilege in our society, not a right. I think that it's incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure that we do whatever we can to make our roads safe.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, but according to Standing Orders 8(2)(b), we must now go back into Assembly for Motions Other than Government Motions. I would ask the hon. member if he would move that the committee do now adjourn debate on this item and that we rise and report.

MR. HENRY: Yes, I so move, Mr. Chairman.

[Motion carried]

[The Speaker in the Chair]

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a certain Bill. The committee reports progress on Bill 212. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE SPEAKER: Opposed? So ordered.

## head: Motions Other than Government Motions

### Regional Health Authorities

513. Mr. Sapers moved:  
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to establish a mechanism to provide for the election of regional health authority board members.  
Mr. Renner moved that Motion Other than Government Motion 513 be amended by adding “, recognizing the

results of the public consultation in progress” after “board members”.

[Debate adjourned October 17: Mr. Van Binsbergen speaking]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're speaking to the amendment to Motion 513. Even though the amendment may at first glance appear to be the embodiment of reason, there's still one major flaw in it. The flaw is that there are no members of the opposition represented on this committee. Therefore, though the input from Albertans to this committee may well be undiluted and unvarnished, what will come out of this committee, this all-Tory committee, will probably be, in the usual tradition of massaging the news, varnished and diluted. I think that is a very good reason to vote against this particular amendment.

3:30

Mr. Speaker, we've seen ample evidence of this kind of ministrations by this government. We've seen in the past umpteen roundtable discussions, and we've seen the result of those discussions being almost a foregone conclusion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, once again I say: let us vote against this amendment.

Thank you.

[Motion as amended carried]

### Timber Management

514. Mr. N. Taylor moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to take measures to require timber management – logging and reforestation – on private land to be conducted under the same standards and guidelines as required by the Alberta government when harvesting timber on Crown lands unless permission to do otherwise is obtained from the provincial government.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who has been even moderately interested in the environment or in the economic recovery of Alberta or lives in Calgary or Edmonton or the west side of Alberta or the north side of Alberta has run across the debate on private logging. Now, that's logging, I should say, on privately held lands. That only makes up a small percentage of Alberta, but it sets in motion, and why it has attracted so much attention is the fact that the . . . Thank you, very much. Realizing how hard it is to control me when I get a full head of steam up, someone just put a time clock in front me.

DR. L. TAYLOR: It was your own members, not us.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I'm not too worried about that. It's the trap door under my seat here that I'm watching: plummet through it to the cafeteria if I don't stop in time.

Logging on private land has come to the fore indirectly because of the government's policy of controlling prices of logs in Alberta. Although about 90 to 95 percent of the trees cut in Alberta are on Crown lands, the provincial government has a policy of, what they call, directing where logs should go. That, plain and simple, is that when you cut a log in Alberta, whether

it be a poplar log or a coniferous log from a pine tree on Crown land, the Crown has told you where they want those logs to be delivered, not always to a specific mill but sometimes to a specific area, sometimes two or three.

Of course, what inevitably happens in a free enterprise economy: when the supplier is restricted to only a few people to buy, that means they lower the price to much less than what the world market is. After all, why pay a big price from somebody that has to deliver to you if you indeed can go out and get it from somewhere else or buy it on the world market? Consequently, what we've had in Alberta is that those people that are on private land, of course, when they sell their logs, can sell it anywhere. They can sell it in the world market. But those cutting on Crown land can only sell their logs to certain mills and to certain people, which as a general rule offer one-third to 60 percent of what the market price is because they've got, in other words, a captive supplier.

Now, that of course means that when B.C. and Montana and Washington or even Saskatchewan wanted logs, there was a great deal of pressure on people that owned private logs, and consequently the price went up – there were only a few logs out there – to the world price. Consequently, not only the loggers but the people that owned the logs on private land were able to make a great deal of money. Nothing wrong with that. The second thing of course that happened is that even those lumber companies that had bought logs in Alberta from Albertans, from Crown land, were able to offer more for private logs because it was just a supplemental bit to keep their mill going up. So what we had was good prices for logs on private land; again, nothing wrong with that.

Lastly, of course, Mr. Speaker, as often happens when cigarettes are one price on one side of the line and another price on the other side of the line, smuggling comes in. If beer or whiskey is one price here and another price there, smuggling comes in. When private logs were two to three times what a government log was, it was sort of natural for the odd log to come sneaking through from the government sector onto the private land. You just maybe left your truck in Uncle Harry's lot one night. You weren't watching, and Uncle Harry sold the whole bloody load of logs, you know. I mean, he thought it was his. Of course, you split the money with Uncle Harry, and everything went on.

So there are quarter sections in this province, Mr. Speaker, I think that have produced more trees in the last two years than they did since the dawn of history. Nobody was keeping track of these logs. Of course, the cabinet minister charged that he didn't want any of them that enviro cops sneaking around. We don't have any cops sneaking around, but we do have a lot of people counting logs now.

Years ago we had a cabinet minister – you remember, Mr. Speaker; I think you were in the House of Commons then – that believed the best way to handle bears was to paint their butts yellow, the dangerous butts. I think Diefenbaker got a lot of kick out of that.

DR. L. TAYLOR: A good way to handle Liberals too.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Is that right?

So now we have the cabinet minister, a reincarnation of that type, ordering his staff to run around the province and paint the butts of logs from private land a different colour so that you can immediately tell as it goes sailing by you on the road whether they've been stolen or not.

All these are just background to the fact that this government has refused to do any regulations with respect to cutting logs on land in the environmental line, Mr. Speaker. Now, that sets in a whole new policy – it's almost unique; I think Alberta might be unique – that says that the environmental laws are different with respect to whether you own the land or the church owns the land or the government owns the land. In general, environmental laws transcend ownership. Just for a minute I will quote from the Harvard Environmental Law Review. It's American, and it's written by lawyers. Both things are not always that welcome in this country. It says:

Any attempt to develop sound environmental policy at the national or state level must confront the fragmented nature of existing land use laws, which leave control of land development almost solely in the hands of local governments.

We saw this down at Pincher Creek; we saw a few other areas. This is one of the problems we have now: it's only local government that are controlling logging regulations. In general, they sign off; it's impossible to do anything with it because, as you know, the logs are moving around and so on.

If you're not that crazy about American advice on environmental law – and I guess *Hansard* might want to get a copy of it. It's page 489, top sentence. Maybe I can give it to a page. Would you photocopy this one particular page and deliver it to *Hansard*, and that way then they could have it. My luck, because I usually lose these reference books or give them back to the library.

The other area that talks about the ownership of private land is in *Growing Demands on a Shrinking Heritage: Managing Resource Use Conflicts*, put out by Ross and Saunders and published – that means edited – by Monique Ross and J. Owen Saunders of the Canadian Institute of Resources Law from that centre of all learning, that centre of reform: Calgary, Alberta. So people can't complain that they're being pushed off to the side there. There are two quotes there that are interesting.

There is also strong evidence, now largely accepted by the public and by governments, that transnational and even global ecosystems are in danger as a result of human activities, notably natural resource exploitation.

In other words, they set the scene, you might say, for what we have, our problem.

**3:40**

Going on to page 2 then:

The natural resource rights themselves are at the point of being redefined by these environmental laws to make it a condition of their exercise that the natural environment not be significantly damaged.

I say that again:

redefined by these environmental laws to make it a condition of their exercise that the natural environment not be significantly damaged.

Now, if we look at Alberta, we have come along quite a ways. Now we do environmentally control what goes on in the case of a coal mine, a strip mine. Whether it be private or public ownership, we don't make a difference. We just say that if you own the land privately, you can't do something with a coal mine that you can't do on public land. We also say the same thing when it comes to replacing topsoil or contouring land and irrigation. It is governed by: whether it's private or public, it doesn't matter; there's only one law that touches that. Industrial purposes, for instance, of reclaimable land after, say, oil and gas have been used: whether you're private land or public land, the reclamation laws are the same environmentally. Of course, when we come to transmission lines and pipelines, there again, whether

the pipeline crosses privately owned property or crosses publicly owned property, it has to obey the same environmental rules.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to trees, no such thing. Forestry, believe it or not, is not under the environmental Act. Now, the minister has said: "Well, don't worry. We will find these people. If they cut too many trees and the streams silt up, if they cut on the slopes and erosion starts in, or if they do anything in such a way that hurts the environment, we'll fine them." Even if they did a pipeline, if they put in an oil site, if they put in a feed lot, all those things, you can't say that because it's privately owned it's any different than publicly owned. He says: well, we'll go and check them out, and if they've done damage, then we will fine them.

That's wrong, as you know, when you control the environment. This is why environmental rules have been put in for coal mines and oil sites and pipelines. To come and fine them afterwards is not of much use. After you've cut down a tree that has taken nature 200 to 300 years or 75 years to grow, coming along and fining the present owner doesn't do anything. Once you've started the hills eroding, it's almost impossible, if they've logged on slopes that they shouldn't.

This is not even considering the aesthetic views, Mr. Speaker, of whether it affects tourism, whether it affects neighbours in the area. I was pleased, for instance, this last year to be instrumental, I think, in getting Weyerhaeuser on the road – you know, you've got to give Weyerhaeuser credit, a big multinational corporation. They were logging up to the road that goes from Grande Prairie to Kakwa. I brought it up in the Legislature with the minister. We visited up there, and they have moved back, and they won't be logging within a hundred metres of the road. It was strictly an aesthetic thing, and it's . . . [interjection] Pardon?

DR. L. TAYLOR: Wayne Jacques talked to them. That's why.

MR. N. TAYLOR: He just said somebody else talked to them. It doesn't matter. Take credit for it, if you like. I'm sure the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat didn't, Mr. Speaker. I was raised down in his country. I remember being 12, 14 years old when my father took me 40 miles to Taber to see my first tree, along with my dog, because the dog wanted to see a tree too. I nearly died of fright when I saw this big thing sticking up there. So I can understand the hon. member's attitude towards trees.

The fact of the matter is – and I give them credit – I want to give credit to Weyerhaeuser. Credit is due, because multinational American corporations are often used as four-letter words. These people, from what I could see, were doing a credible job.

Now, back again to the reason we're making this motion. Why should forestry be exempted? Feedlots aren't. Pipelines aren't. Oil industries aren't. An industrial plant isn't. Anything else that's done on private land has to conform to environmental laws. Yet we have here rather a unique specimen, I might say. People are saying or the government has said or the minister has – I'm not sure the government has really had a chance to debate it; I'm not sure if it's been brought up in caucus really, but it should have been – "Well, private ownership gives us the right to do whatever we want." This of course, Mr. Speaker, comes from the fact that when our forefathers came out here and looked low over the plains as they scanned them from Drumheller all the way up to Edmonton and north, they said, "The first thing we have to do is shoot all those buffalo and get rid of all those bloody trees." There was no concept that a tree was anything more than something that got in the way of seeding your quarter section to wheat

or whatever. This is carried now through the modern age, and we're still saying: "Nobody touch us. If the tree's going to be cut down, that's fine. It's up to the owner."

Well, Mr. Speaker, times have changed. It's not up to the owner anymore, any more than we would say, "You can build a sulphur plant there; it is up to you," any more than you would say that we could put a strip coal mine up there. We've learned that that's different, and we have to do the same thing with trees. I'm not saying to stop them from cutting trees. I'm just saying that the cutting of trees has to be moved in as to an environmental area, and the ownership has nothing to do with it. It has nothing to do with nearly anything else we have, because the environment transcends ownership. After all, the environment points out more than anything else, Mr. Speaker, that we're nothing but stewards of the land, trying to pass it on to our children and our grandchildren in as good a condition or better condition than we found it. To argue that trees and forestry should be exempted – that's the only thing I know of that's exempted in Alberta – from the humanities laws on environment defies the imagination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are others who want to speak on this. I just wanted to touch on this, because we still have speakers coming on the whole area of forestry, the Forests Act. Also, I think, hon. member, there'll be some hon. members mentioning what happens when forestry is uncontrolled. I just wanted to set the parameters, you might say, about what the following discussion should be.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. JACQUES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on Motion 514. I listened with interest to the eloquence of the hon. Member for Redwater. Inasmuch as he strayed a little bit from the motion and the intent of the motion and attempted to set some background, there are a few things that I wish to just comment on in his preamble.

He spoke of an artificial price with regard to Crown timber versus that of private timber. Mr. Speaker, in my real life, in my normal life I worked in the forest products industry for 27 years. Over 20 of those years were in the province of Alberta, specifically in the Grande Prairie area. We are the home of beautiful forests, water, and agricultural land. If we speak of the policy of the provincial government, which indeed is commensurate with many other jurisdictions, particularly that of British Columbia, which is by far the largest in terms of the harvesting of wood, we find that an investor who comes to this province, in terms of the forest products industry, basically says: "I'm willing to put in \$100 million or \$300 million or whatever the dollar amount is, but I need some security of supply. I need something that says that I will have some fibre. That fibre may be logs. It may be chips. But I need something to backstop. It may not be 100 percent of it, but I've got to deal with a significant portion of it."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the holder of the forest management agreement or the holder of a quota certificate does indeed have the rights to harvest the annual allowable cut from either a designated land area in the case of a forest management agreement or from a specific, defined area in the case of a quota. So generally speaking what happens in those cases is that the company or the proprietor, whoever it may be that has the rights to that, will indeed engage somebody in some cases to go and harvest that timber, to haul it for him. He pays not for the value of the timber, because he has the right to that timber; what he is

paying for is the cost to transport, to bring that timber to his harvesting facility. So when we deal with Crown land, as the hon. member pointed out, it indeed is a very substantially different situation than that of private land.

3:50

Now, when we come to private land, yes, as the owner of that land you then have the right with regard to the disposition of that timber, and whether it's conifer timber, whether it's deciduous timber, that is your right. The speaker was correct to the extent of saying that external forces in the marketplace, particularly in other jurisdictions, indeed do have an impact, as they should, on the free market economy on the value of that timber from that private location, and if the operator, the consumer in the province of Alberta wants to purchase that timber, then he has to be prepared to pay the market value for it. He doesn't get any special deal on it. He's got to be competitive. If he's not prepared to do that, then that private timber in many cases will be exported, most notably into the province of British Columbia.

With regard to the issue that he brought up with regard to smuggling, Mr. Speaker, that is somewhat of a red herring. We know from a lot of research, from a lot of information that smuggling of Crown timber has not been a major issue. We know that it has occurred. We have done monitoring of that, and indeed the minister not that long ago issued in a press release some accountability and some accounting for what has happened in that particular area. But it is one that can be controlled to a reasonable degree, and again it really has nothing to do with this motion.

The member then went on quoting certain environmental statements from both a U.S. publication and a Canadian publication, I believe based down in Calgary, and wove the theme through to the point that surface strip mining is not exempt, but he also said that forestry is exempt. Well, I would have to challenge that statement. Operators in this province who go out and harvest from Crown lands indeed are subject to the appropriate environmental laws and regulations, and there are specific, very specific, laws and regulations that apply only to the forest industry. All of that deals simply with the harvesting – simply the harvesting – of it. There again is another set of regulations and another set of criteria with regard to reforestation, where applicable, in terms of Crown land and timber that is removed from that. So to suggest that forestry is somehow exempt, particularly in terms of Crown land, is simply not accurate. Now, if the member had said only private lands – only private lands – then I would agree with him to only a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, and I will get on with that.

When I first read the motion of the member, I did have a certain amount of sympathy with the intent of it, I guess because of my background in trees and all of those good things. You know, my heavens, the member has a true, genuine concern here. But I said: I've got to do some more research on this. So I started delving in and adding to my own knowledge base that I already had, and as I did that, the issues became much more focused, and the facts certainly revealed a dramatically different picture. I was then puzzled perhaps as to why the member would submit a private member's motion to do what he is proposing to do. In other words, what was the rationale for it?

So I spent a fair amount of time, Mr. Speaker, posing some questions, posing questions to see if they would somehow submit the rationale to the motion. I asked the question, for example: did the constituents of the hon. member rise up in masses and demand – demand – that these regulations and extensions be placed? Did

the member present overwhelming evidence in support of his motion that there indeed is a major problem? Did the agricultural community say that they have no regard for existing environmental law and regulations? Did the agricultural community say that they are poor managers and poor planners? Did the agricultural community rise up and say, "Give us more laws and more regulations and more bureaucracy"? Did the agricultural community plead to put more government control over their day-to-day decision-making? Did the agricultural community say that increased education and awareness is not an acceptable alternative? Did the agricultural community say that they wanted their property rights and privileges to be decreased or in some way eroded? Did the agricultural community rise up and say to this Legislative Assembly, "Save us from ourselves; save us"?

The answer to every one of those questions is obviously a no. But conversely, Mr. Speaker, was this motion driven by pressure from the urban members of the caucus, and was this motion driven by the Liberal doctrine that says that more laws and more regulations and more bureaucracy are better for the people of this province and particularly the agricultural community of this province?

Mr. Speaker, let us proceed with some reality checks. The first reality check: in an average year 93 percent of the timber harvested in Alberta is located on provincially owned Crown land, and the timber harvested from that is subject to severe operating rules and conditions, environmental rules. Enforcement of the ground rules is done under section 100(b) of the timber management regulations. It should also be noted that the planting and the harvesting rules apply to both conifer and deciduous timber. The sponsor of this motion wants to apply the same rules to 7 percent of the timber harvest in an average year that currently apply to 93 percent of the timber harvest that occurs in this province.

The second reality check, Mr. Speaker, is that certainly most members of this Chamber are aware that the province is divided into two areas. We have the white area, and we have the green area. The green area contains virtually all the Crown timber, whereas the white area is predominantly and by far agricultural land. It is from the white area that virtually all private wood is harvested, both conifer and deciduous. Regrettably – and I don't think it was the intent of the member – this motion really targets and focuses on the agricultural community, the farmers who basically have the private land to have the ability to harvest and sell on the open market.

Really if you took the motion to the extreme, it would say: well, it's okay if you go out there and harvest your grain and do those types of things, but we want to step in and tell you how to harvest your trees, because we know better. You know, this motion, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of an earlier proposal in this 23rd Legislature from the opposition, and that proposal called for agricultural land use decisions to be made by an agricultural land conservation board, that would have developed a new bureaucracy in the city to tell the folks in rural Alberta how to run their affairs.

The third reality check, Mr. Speaker, is that when we're addressing the volume of timber harvested from private land, we must recognize that on average 30 percent is harvested from native land. Thirty percent on average of private wood is harvested from native land. Now, we all know that the rules for harvesting on provincial Crown land cannot be imposed on federally controlled reservation land.

MR. N. TAYLOR: That's not true. You don't know what you're talking about.

4:00

MR. JACQUES: In other words, Mr. Speaker, this motion would on average only apply to 5 percent of the total annual timber harvest in this province.

The member says, "That's not true." Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true, and indeed the federal authorities had to step in – had to step in – and deal with some very specific problems that were occurring on those lands.

The fourth reality check is: let us not forget the Soil Conservation Act, the Forest and Prairie Protection Act, the Water Resources Act, or even the federal Fisheries Act. These Acts and their regulations are applicable to timber harvesting impacts on private land. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the use of educational techniques, increased awareness programs and campaigns are certainly much more effective ways of addressing a relatively minute problem, which in most cases is one of perception and not one of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. Member for Redwater cares very much about the environment of our beautiful province. I also care for and share that concern, and I know that every member in this Assembly does, and I am first to condemn logging harvesting practices that are offside with acceptable and sound harvesting techniques. I have also stood in this Assembly and condemned certain logging activities which can best be described as mining and at worst as devastating. However, more laws, more regulations, more dollars, and more bureaucracy is not the appropriate solution in dealing with a perceived problem that has yet to even be defined in scope because it is so minute. Yet we know, based on every evidence that we have and all the statistical data that we have, that it is certainly negligible in terms of the total timber harvest.

Let us continue with our program of education and awareness. Let us continue to make the farmers more knowledgeable with regard to harvesting techniques, with regard to the issues that surround watercourses. They are responsible people, Mr. Speaker. They respond. In fact, they are probably the best environmentalists we have in this province. Yet that is virtually where all the private wood is coming from, and in most cases it's not a problem, it's not an issue because they respect the environment. They are environmental stewards.

For those few bad actors that are around, let us continue to work on the education, to work on the awareness. In fact, I've even seen in my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, where the pressure of the agricultural community on a particular neighbour was most astounding with regard to the practices that he was initially going to carry out versus what he ultimately did. That was accomplished not because of standing in this Legislature passing laws or regulations but through the process of awareness, education, and the ultimate responsibility that virtually every agricultural owner in this province is most willing to accept because it's part of their day-to-day life.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the defeat of this motion. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased this afternoon to join the debate on Motion 514, as put forward by the hon. Member for Redwater. I appreciate very much the comments of the Member for Redwater and the reason for bringing forward this motion.

I also listened very intently to the comments from the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti and his reasoning for voting against this particular motion. As I understood the hon. member, the reason that we should vote against this is because it's only a small part of Alberta and therefore environmental regulations aren't necessary. It's only a small portion. Now, apparently that would, I guess, imply that once you hit a certain threshold, then environmental rules kick in or should kick in, as they are for Crown land, but because it's a small amount, they should not. I for the life of me could not understand the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti in his comments about concerns being raised by Albertans about the issue of logging on private land.

The member tried to suggest that there had not been concerns expressed by Albertans or by constituents about this issue. I don't know where the member has been, but this issue had been raised by Albertans day after day after day in the spring of this year because of what people were witnessing out there in the rush to harvest private timber for the price, which was a very rich price, of their private timber to go to British Columbia. We saw photographs in the newspaper, we saw pictures on TV, we saw trucks lining up in Banff and Jasper crossing the border with logs coming from private land.

The Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti says: why is the hon. Member for Redwater bringing this forward; nobody cares. Mr. Speaker, on March 1 of this year the Premier of the province responded to the concerns of Albertans by setting up a task force to deal with the issue of logging on private land. He appointed the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, and the Minister of Environmental Protection. Now the hon. member is saying to the Member for Redwater: why are you bothering raising this motion; nobody cares. Well, why would the Premier of the province of Alberta be setting up a task force? Because it's such an important issue. I mean, I didn't ever hear the Premier say that it wasn't an important issue. I'll grant you that the Premier's done nothing. I'll grant you that his task force has done absolutely nothing. I'll grant you that the task force made some announcement about some permit system that was coming in, you know those overbureaucratized ministers that keep firing more regulations and more regulations. That big, bloated government was going to bring in more regulations. What was needed was a permitting system to control the process of logging, the environmental standards, and the rush to cut them all down and send them to British Columbia.

What we've had to this point in time is a task force committee of ministers of the Crown sit around and talk about the issue of private logging, talk about announcements that they're going to make in the future, do absolutely nothing. Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Redwater has done something. He's brought forward the motion to allow members of this Assembly to address and deal with the very important issue of logging on private land.

Now, the irony of this motion, and in fact one of the very good points about this motion, is that it does not ask for any more bureaucracy. The only member so far who's talked about more bureaucracy is the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti. These will be exactly the same rules that are applicable to Crown land to be applicable to the logging procedures on private land: exactly the same rules, exactly the same procedures.

Now, it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that if the rules for harvesting timber on Crown land are there for the reason of environmental protection and are there to protect the environment, then why is it not the case that the same rules ought to apply to trees standing

on private land? As my colleague from Redwater suggested to the members of the Assembly, environmental protection does not distinguish between Crown land boundaries and private land boundaries. It does not make that distinction. The same rules ought to apply wherever and whenever you are harvesting timber in the province of Alberta. The system is in place, and the reason for the system remains viable.

If hon. members will agree that the reason that the operating procedures are there for the harvesting of Crown land is for the protection of the environment, to ensure that the trees are harvested in a responsible manner, then the same rules ought to apply to private land. That's all the motion from the Member for Redwater says: make the same rules applicable to private land. The argument can't be made that the rules for Crown land are not appropriate. They are. We can get in to all the other debates about whether or not they're stringent enough, but the procedure that's required for the operator is to follow the operating guidelines, and we're asking in this motion, Mr. Speaker, that in fact that apply to private land as well.

#### 4:10

The approach that is being suggested by the Member for Redwater is not particularly new and is not particularly new for other jurisdictions close to the province of Alberta who also have very strong beliefs in individual property rights. As my friend from Redwater has said, this in no way impacts upon the property of the individual who owns that land. We are simply saying with this motion, as we do for virtually any other activity that's undertaken by an owner of private land, that there are procedures and regulations that must be followed so that we can protect the environment.

There are many other jurisdictions that have done that and have done so, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, very successfully. They continue to recognize property rights. They continue to recognize the communal good of requiring those operating procedures and the environmentally sound harvesting of timber on private land, the same as they do on public land. Many of the states in the Pacific northwest have legislation or regulations that require that. We can in passing this motion look more closely and more carefully at our neighbours and the legislation and the rules that they have in place to determine what's best for the province of Alberta, but at the very least we embrace the proposition that regulating and protecting the environment on private land is no different than protecting the environment on Crown land.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti has suggested that we have legislation in place that will deal with the issues of bad harvesting practices. Now, we have heard the same comment from the Minister of Environmental Protection. There has been reference in debate that has taken place in this Assembly, particularly in question period on logging on private land, that we have in place the Soil Conservation Act and the Fisheries Act, so whenever there are inappropriate harvesting activities taking place, the minister has the ability under that legislation to take some action against that inappropriate action through those two pieces of legislation. But again it's all after the fact. It's all after the fact.

The approach that the government ought to take is a proactive approach rather than a reactive approach. Once the trees are cut down, once the soil erosion has taken place, once the fish stocks are in jeopardy, what value is there for the government to say, "We're gonna hammer them, and we're gonna hammer them hard." Granted, Mr. Speaker, that kind of legislative clout should be there. I'm not suggesting otherwise, but the approach should

be prior to that happening. The approach should be a very clear regulatory environment so that we know when they're offside and we have that much greater legitimacy in hitting them hard. If we do it beforehand, if we identify that in fact the regulatory structure that's in place for Crown land is in place for private land, if we have that clearly identified, then the government gains greater legitimacy in prosecuting those who have failed to follow the sound environmental practices.

Mr. Speaker, we had the discussion in this Assembly last session about the bull trout. We went so far as to name the bull trout as an official emblem of the province of Alberta. Much of the discussion that took place at that time was a recognition of the fact that the habitat of the bull trout is in very serious jeopardy. Part of the problem with that, with the habitat of the bull trout, is the logging, is the removal of trees, is soil erosion, is siltation, is loss of habitat, is loss of spawning grounds: all of those problems which directly or indirectly bear on forestry practices and harvesting techniques.

We agreed in this Assembly that recognition of the bull trout would help increase awareness of the problems that can be associated with harvesting and with maintaining the integrity of the habitat of the bull trout. Well, the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti said that perhaps we could suggest that that's part of the education process. But that's not enough. That's not enough. The motion suggests that what we do is make the same rules that the government now uses and the government now stands behind for the harvesting of timber on private land.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that in many cases the harvesting of timber off private land is done by a contractor who essentially has their own procedures for the removal of the timber fibre off private land. Yes, the obligation and the responsibility rests with the landowner, but I think there are many cases out there where the landowner is ill prepared to deal with the operator who wants to come in and harvest that land, who will tell that landowner that there is a great and valuable resource on their private land. "The market price is high. We can move it along. You can get a big chunk of money." They like that idea. It's a very inviting idea.

So while the landowner is responsible, the landowner is ill prepared for what may happen ultimately that they were not prepared for. The motion in requiring "the same standards and guidelines" as required for harvesting Crown lands will call upon the landowner as the individual responsible to apply for that operating permit, and it will better prepare that individual landowner for the consequences of the harvesting of timber off of his land and for understanding the responsibility to ensure that it is done in an environmentally responsible fashion.

I think the motion is very clear. I think the motion is appropriate. I think the motion is timely. I think the motion is streamlined. I do not think the motion creates greater bureaucracy. I think the motion can be supported, if you support the proposition that harvesting rules should apply to Crown land and should therefore apply to private land. Mr. Speaker, if you believe in environmentally sound management and stewardship of the forests of Alberta, regardless of whether that forest stands on Crown land or on private land, then my submission is that members of the Assembly must vote in favour of this motion, if they truly believe that.

Mr. Speaker, those are my comments, and obviously I stand before the Assembly and recommend voting in favour of Motion 514.

4:20

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I spoke to this issue one time before, about logging on privately owned land, a couple of years ago when it first became an issue in this House. I think it should be clear that this is owned property. A short time ago I attended an event in the beautiful constituency of Drayton Valley-Calmar, and it was honouring people that had been in the agriculture community, in the farming community, in that area for over 50 years. I want to go back a little bit and give some of the uninformed opposite a little bit of history. I'm sure the hon. Member for Redwater is old enough to remember some of this.

Some 50 years ago these people moved out into an area where they had the opportunity to buy some rather cheap land and get a start in what they wanted to do: farming. There were some cleared spaces on some of this land, Mr. Speaker, but the process at that point in time, even on a homestead, was that they were required by law to go out and clear and pile and burn and get rid of so many acres per year. So they did that in order to prove up their homesteads. As time went on – and there was some timber on all of this land – people did harvest some of it. They sold some of it at probably \$10 or \$15 or \$20 a thousand, which is a far cry from what it is now.

Mr. Speaker, literally, there were not just thousands but hundreds of thousands of acres that were cleared, pushed into brush piles, and burnt. There was no hue and cry from anybody about them doing that. They owned the land, and it was the only way they could convert it from bush to an agriculture operation, to a livestock operation predominantly in those areas of Alberta. Most of these people are very environmentally conscious because they live with the environment every day. For about 45 years of those 50 years trees were considered a weed. They couldn't sell them. They couldn't get enough money out of them to make it worth while trying to log and sell it as timber to anybody, so they went in and actually burnt all this brush. It was their land. They were trying to convert it to an agriculture operation. They did this in order to go into a more economical operation, such as livestock farming: cattle, horses, sheep, or whatever they wanted to go into.

In recent years there has been an education program out there to try and teach some of the people and encourage them to go into tree lot farming. While I'm very supportive of that, it's a little hard to tell somebody that they should wait for 50 or 60 years to cut those logs down when the market is there right now and they want to convert this land for agriculture purposes anyway. So they go in and they log it off, and if the price isn't right, they will in fact put it in brush piles and burn it. I've seen it. I've done it myself. We've brushed a lot of land out in that country, and I'm just one of many that have done it. We actually brushed trees that big, very good lumber, timber trees, and we put them in brush piles, as the hon. Member for Redwater knows and has seen many times.

So then we get to the last two or three years, Mr. Speaker, when timber became a premium. Logs came at a premium because of the very fact – and the hon. member mentioned this – that it was a small part of their quota in the British Columbia mills. They tried to make up to retain their quota. So they would pay nearly anything to get these trees there, and I'm sure that there was probably some stealing of trees off Crown land. I think it was fairly minimal, but I'm sure some of that did take place.

The whole exercise, Mr. Speaker, has centred around this being privately owned land. I can grow hay on my land and I can sell it. I can grow livestock on my land and I can sell it. I can grow corn on my land and sell it. I grow those trees, I support them, and if I can't take them off of there and sell them at any time, well then there's something wrong with private ownership. We must maintain that.

The difference between private land and public land: where we're doing the logging it's very environmentally sensitive in a number of ways. What we're trying to do in the forestry industry is maintain a sustainable resource that is there and is going to be there. It's based on an 80- to 120-year cycle, where the trees will come back and they're able to be logged again. There are not too many of the private landowners that want to do this, because for one thing they're not going to be around in another hundred years to take the results of their profit to the bank at that point in time. So they would rather change it to an agriculture industry and move along with it and make sure that they get their money out of it.

The strange thing is that these trees were worth nothing. When we brushed them and we piled them up and we burnt them and we went back and repiled and we picked roots and we did all the obviously menial tasks, these were worth nothing. Now, they're worth some money, and all of a sudden everybody wants to get into the picture and tell the owner of that land what he can do with the resource that he's raising on that land. I think it's against the principles of this government and I think it's against the principles of the people of Alberta to interfere in private landownership and how they sell their produce.

Thank you.

DR. NICOL: Mr. Speaker, I want to take an opportunity to address Motion 514 as well. We've heard a lot of comments this afternoon about the issue of the ability to kind of do as you please with your own property. We've heard from a couple of members very specific examples about how we have to treat forestry, or trees, the fibre produced by those trees, as any other crop in agriculture. Well, what I would like to say is that I think this motion would effectively suggest to the government that it put in place a set of management practice guidelines which would make harvesting trees very similar to what we have when we deal with harvesting other crops in agriculture.

We listened to the reality checks from the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti and brush cutting on the homestead from the Member for Drayton Valley-Calmar, and we basically got to a position now where we assume that it's still the environment we're talking about. Well, Mr. Speaker, in agriculture if we farm in a method or in a system that jeopardizes the environment, the government has the right to come in and make amends. In southern Alberta there were a number of occasions where wind erosion . . .

THE SPEAKER: The Chair regrets having to interrupt the hon. Member for Lethbridge-East. I must advise that the time limit for consideration of this item of business has concluded, and the Chair is now required to put all questions necessary to dispose of the matter.

Would all those in favour of Motion 514 proposed by the hon. Member for Redwater, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 4:29 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Abdurahman	Kirkland	Soetaert
Bracko	Leibovici	Taylor, N.
Bruseker	Massey	Van Binsbergen
Collingwood	Nicol	Vasseur
Germain	Sapers	White
Henry	Sekulic	Wickman

4:40

Against the motion:

Ady	Havelock	Paszkowski
Black	Herard	Pham
Brassard	Hierath	Renner
Burgener	Hlady	Rostad
Calahasen	Jacques	Severtson
Cardinal	Jonson	Shariff
Coutts	Kowalski	Smith
Day	Laing	Stelmach
Dinning	Langevin	Tannas
Doerksen	Magnus	Taylor, L.
Dunford	Mar	Thurber
Evans	McClellan	Trynchy
Forsyth	McFarland	West
Friedel	Mirosh	Woloshyn
Gordon	Oberg	Yankowsky
Haley		

Totals: For - 18 Against - 46

[Motion lost]

**head: Government Motions  
Standing Committees**

26. Mr. Day moved:

Be it resolved that changes to the membership of the following committees be approved by this Assembly: on the Standing Committee on Private Bills that Mr. Langevin replace Dr. Oberg and on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that Dr. Oberg replace Mr. Friedel and that Mr. Coutts replace Mr. Friedel as deputy chairman.

MR. BRUSEKER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we concur and have no difficulty with the motion put forward by the Government House Leader.

[Motion carried]

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

[Mr. Tannas in the Chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: I'd call the committee to order.

**Bill 46**  
**Regulations Amendment Act, 1995**

THE CHAIRMAN: We'd invite hon. members to make their comments and suggest amendments, et cetera.

We'll call on the sponsor, the hon. Member for Peace River.

MR. FRIEDEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to have this opportunity to stand up on the second day in a row here to debate this extremely important issue. It's unfortunate that I don't have the opportunity to have our Government House Leader here to incite the troops, as he did yesterday. It certainly helped make this into a really fiery debate. I guess we'll have to carry on today in a more serious, more studious manner. I do have to admit, however, that the House leader does have a way of getting people's attention.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're better on your own, Gary.

MR. FRIEDEL: I know I've got a fan over there.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, seriously, we did discuss this yesterday. I don't think I need to spend any amount of time in opening preamble. I would just like to remind the members that are going to be discussing this Bill that the amendment that is before you is not the review plan. I believe yesterday most of the discussion centred around the fact that information regarding the process, regarding the review plan itself, was not apparent in this amendment Act.

The intent of this is to provide a mechanism for facilitating the orderly implanting of a sunset clause into existing regulations so that they can be reviewed in an orderly way over the next three years. All the details that are necessary for the working of the plan – the sunset plan itself, the regulation impact report, and any of the other processes – are available in the document called Alberta Regulatory Reform, the work plan. It's been available for four or five months. There are hundreds of copies out. Hopefully people that were debating yesterday and might continue to debate today will have taken the opportunity to avail themselves of a copy, if they haven't already, and even more preferably I hope they read it before today.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the comments and concerns and questions, and I'll be glad to answer them as they come along.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. The first thing I want to do is open with remarks about the Regulations Amendment Act, this small Bill of profound policy and a mirror into the soul of the government, if I could use that colourful expression.

Before I do that, I want to take a moment to thank so very much the hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert for standing up yesterday and making an eloquent and impassioned comment about the lawyers in the Legislative Assembly. I also want to take a moment to congratulate the hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat, who himself stood up and acknowledged that he could not exist, his business couldn't exist, his business couldn't flourish without the aid and assistance of lawyers and chartered accountants. I think it is wonderful that Members in this Legislative Assembly are prepared to recognize the contribution that professionals make to this Legislative Assembly and to every walk of life, and I wanted to thank my learned colleague for

those kind words that she made about lawyers. Why she was making those kind words was of course about the Bill that we're debating now, and that is Bill 46, the Regulations Amendment Act, 1995.

Now, this Bill has undergone a lot of strain in the last few months. In fact, by way of interesting anecdote – and I know all members of the House will want to hear of this anecdote – I asked the page yesterday to bring me the Regulations Act out of the books that we have on file here. A very simple request: I asked for the Regulations Act. I opened that legislation to the point where I could fit in the hon. member's amendment, and of course what did I find? The hon. member's amendment was on section 11, but the Regulations Act as filed, Mr. Chairman, ended at section 9. Section 10 was missing. Now, why was that? Why are the legislative enactments of this particular House in error like that? Well, not in error, hon. member. The fact of the matter is that it shows how quickly we had just reviewed this Regulations Act. We had reviewed this Regulations Act just at the tail end of the first portion of this session so that the changes had not yet even been incorporated into our very legislation in this Legislative Assembly.

Now, what's the point of that? You're going to say: "Oh, is the hon. Member for Fort McMurray simply making wasted points?" The point of it is that if we cannot look to a central place for our legislation that is updated, current, and timely, how can we expect the public to stay on top of that legislation, when we're supposedly trained to deal with it in this Chamber, and then ask them further to look at regulations? The 15,000 or 16,000 or how many thousands of regulations we have in this province, how can we ask Albertans to even look for those, understand those, interpret those, when we can see that our own legislation that we're debating today is months behind, even in the filing right here in the Legislative Assembly? What a paradox, ladies and gentlemen of this Chamber, that you can't pull out a *Revised Statutes of Alberta* in this Chamber and get the *Revised Statutes of Alberta* as they are and as they are proclaimed. We ask Albertans to understand our regulations and understand our laws, and we give them no help whatsoever in that task. What we do is put more hidden regulations in front of them.

#### 4:50

Now, I say to the hon. member – and it's important for us to debate this in committee, Mr. Chairman – that if this amendment to the Regulations Act is of so fired up burning importance now, if it's so fired up and burning in importance, why is it that this was not put in with the last amendment to the Regulations Act, which occurred only a few months ago when we put section 10 into the Act?

To save the hon. members looking – and I'm grateful and I must acknowledge at this time the great work of Legislative Counsel in digging out the change to the Regulations Act – in that particular section 10 that was put into the Act and why it's important now, because you have to understand the context in which section 11 will now fit, is that the Lieutenant Governor in Council was allowed to make regulations that "correct references to the name of a department, a minister, an official, an Act or a regulation of Alberta . . ."

- (b) repeal a regulation for which the statutory authority to make the regulation has been repealed . . .
- (c) correct typographical and grammatical errors;
- (d) repeal a regulation that is spent.

To repeal a regulation who's time has come is basically what "spent" means. An amendment under that Act "may be made

even though the regulation . . . was made by a member of the Executive Council.”

So if that amendment last time was so fired-up important, and if cleaning up the regulations in the manner proposed by the hon. member is so fired-up important, why wasn't the content of Bill 46 incorporated last year when we debated this?

You know, the hon. Government House Leader so wants to say how much time he feels, in his assessment, is wasted here discussing democratic processes.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Adam, are you running for leadership?

MR. GERMAIN: You know, the hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat wants to chirp at me again from his sitting down position after I was so gracious in commending him on his integrity in recognizing the importance that lawyers and accountants have in his life and his fairness in giving them credit for the success such as he has of his fine family businesses. Now I see that the thanks I get for that is to be sniped at from the sitting position. That man himself, a highly educated and well-spoken man, ought to be ashamed of himself, I say to you, Mr. Chairman. He ought to be ashamed of himself.

MR. N. TAYLOR: How would you feel if one of your cows bit you?

MR. GERMAIN: I want to disassociate myself from the remark just made by the hon. Member for Redwater.

We now move on, Mr. Chairman, to discussing what the point that I want to make in connection with this Bill is. The point that I want to make is that it is very difficult for the public to understand regulations. It is very difficult for the public to understand why we have them, how many we have, where we file them. So anything that this Legislative Assembly can do to assist the public in that regard is an important positive first step, and it is the place where the hon. member ought to go looking for his reform in regulations, instead of just putting on artificial grandfathering clauses, which this amendment seeks to do.

Now, this statutory amendment, Mr. Chairman, starts from an improper foundation and from an improper principle. What it says is that we haven't got the time to tackle all the regulations we have in the province of Alberta, so what we're going to do is put grandfather clauses on them, and that will force us to look at them. That to me seems to be awkward thinking. Surely we should be examining each and every regulation carefully and conscientiously and then determining which ones can be repealed. You see, there already is authority in section 10(1)(d) to repeal a regulation that is spent, so we do not need section 11 of this particular Regulations Act.

I would urge the hon. member, now having seen that, to stand up and ask that his Bill be withdrawn or encourage his caucus to vote against this regulation Bill in its entirety. It is not necessary, and what it does is make the assumption that we do not review our regulations. It begins with the concept in paragraph 11(1): “In order to ensure that regulations filed under this Act are reviewed to determine whether they are still necessary,” we will set up termination dates for them. So we will set up arbitrary termination dates, and then we will go searching to see if in fact the regulation is still valid. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that is wrong in principle, that puts the cart before the horse, that has us putting into place potential terminations of regulations without knowing whether they are valid or not.

Now, there is a way in which the hon. member can get help for his quest. He can refer these matters and he can ask the Premier and the Legislative Assembly to reactivate the long dormant Standing Committee on Law and Regulations, that we have in this particular Legislative Assembly, and ask that particular chair to convene that committee and deal with these regulations, deal with them right up front in an open, constructive, and positive way. That would be so important for the citizens of Alberta, because it would mean that the MLAs that sit on that committee would themselves become more versed with the detail of the regulation. It would mean that the hon. chair of that committee, the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, himself a member of the legal profession, would be contributing his expertise to the legislative process, and he would be contributing something that he knows something about because he is legally trained. He is a member of the bar in good standing, and he would have an opportunity to make that great contribution and to redeem himself for having criticized the Premier for washing his car on government money.

I want to go on, Mr. Chairman, and discuss another problem with this particular enactment. The other problem that we have is the problem of those rights that are stranded by the repeal of a regulation. Every time we repeal a regulation in the province of Alberta because a deadline has been set on it when that regulation in fact is not obsolete, we run the risk of having affected peoples' rights, who ordered their business affairs on the basis of the regulation that was passed at the time.

Now, let me just give the hon. members at least one hypothetical example so that you know what I'm talking about. Last year the hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat told everybody in this Legislative Assembly that he was a bull s-h-i-p-p-e-r. He will then know that the size of truck tires in the province of Alberta and the size of tires you put on the truck, a transport truck, relate to the distribution of its weight and in turn relate to whether you can drive that truck in all weather on all roads in the province of Alberta. There are regulations that affect all of that.

Now, I haven't bought any large transport truck tires or tractor trailer tires lately, but I did have the pleasure of buying a set of automobile tires lately, Mr. Chairman, and the price of those automobile tires had increased fourfold since I bought my last set of automobile tires previously. As a result, I presume that truck tires are probably anywhere from \$2,000 to \$6,000 a tire. I might be wrong, but I just use that as an example. If the transport truck has 16 tires on the entire rig, that is a tremendous expense. Now, suppose we have a regulation that allows certain trucks to be driven with certain size tires, and we repeal that regulation. Does the chap who just finished refurbishing his truck have to go out and buy new tires for every single wheel and rim on that particular truck? That is simply one example.

5:00

Let us suppose that we have another example. We have regulations to control the retail selling of firearms in the province of Alberta. Some might be federal, but we might have some regulations that control how you can sell gunpowder, ammunition, that sort of thing. Let's just use that as an example. Suppose the police authorities get concerned about how much gunpowder a retailer stores in his store, and the retailer has just stocked up 10 thousand dollars' worth of resale gunpowder or resale hunting supplies. Then we come along, and the regulation that allows him to do that is in some fashion repealed. What happens to him? Does he have to dispose of his surplus stock? Is he in fact given an opportunity to change over time? Is he given an opportunity

to ask somewhere for relief? Those are the kinds of transition concerns.

We have 83 members in this Legislative Assembly. They will be able to talk about different amendments, different rules. What if we put special amendments into the regulations to protect special places and allow certain activity in those special places and then those regulations are terminated so that we revert to a higher, more detailed standard? What happens to the people who have ordered their affairs on the basis of those changes in those regulations? So I urge members to be cautious when they consider the ongoing debate on this particular piece of legislation.

Now, against that general backdrop, Mr. Chairman, it's my honour tonight on behalf of the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo to move certain amendments to this particular piece of legislation. I want to say to all members, so there is no misunderstanding, that these amendments are presented together, stapled together, four amendments, but I want to make it abundantly clear that it is the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo's wish and desire that I reiterate on his behalf now in filing these amendments that they be debated on an individual basis and voted on on an individual basis. So individual voting and individual debate on these particular amendments.

Mr. Chairman, if you wish, I can just stop my commentaries now while we distribute the amendments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Fort McMurray, just on process. The committee decides, if we have a group of amendments, how they're going to discuss them and whether they're going to go. If you move these individually, which is your perfect right to do, then they are by their method of introduction individual and voted individually.

MR. GERMAIN: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: For convenience the four of them are coming out, but we're going to start, presumably, with number one, which you were going to move.

MR. GERMAIN: Okay. Thank you.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I see that the amendments are being handed out at this time, so I want to draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly to 11(1) in Bill 46, part of section 2. This is the first section we are proposing to amend, and the amendment we propose is to delete the entire subsection 11(1) and replace it with this following subsection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I invite Fort McMurray to continue in his efforts here, the Chair would indicate that the appropriate signatures of counsel and of the mover are filed here at the Table.

Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you very much for assisting me through the procedural maze there, Mr. Chairman. This amendment, therefore, would leave subsection 11(1) as follows:

In order to ensure that regulations filed under this Act are reviewed to determine whether they are still necessary or relevant, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, subject to approval of the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations, may, by regulation, set expiry dates for those regulations.

Let me tell you and focus the members that the difference in this particular amendment is that the regulation, before an expiry date is set, would have to go before the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations. This is an important policy opportunity for the Members of this Legislative Assembly to take control of the process of this Assembly by allowing a committee chaired by one of your members, the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, himself legally trained – they can take control of this.

It does not change the spirit of the legislation. It does not change the motive of the mover of the legislation. It does not change the hoped-for result of the mover of the legislation, which is to bring about some grandfathering. What this does is refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations.

With those initial comments, I will take my place and allow others to debate the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader on the amendment.

MRS. BLACK: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the committee do now rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[The Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. HAVELock: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills. The committee reports progress on the following: Bill 46. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

5:10

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in this report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed?

So ordered.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:11 p.m.]

