

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, March 3, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 226**
An Act to Amend
The Juvenile Court Act

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, An Act to Amend The Juvenile Court Act. The purpose of this bill is to give a judge of the juvenile court the power to order a juvenile delinquent to make restitution by work or service to the person who suffered from his delinquency or for the benefit of the community, as the judge thinks appropriate.

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to be able to introduce to the members of the Assembly a number of visitors in the members gallery. They are the housing committee from Atikameg: Mr. George Davis Laboucan, chairman, Mr. George T. Laboucan, Mr. George P. Laboucan, Mike Whitehead, Denis R. Laboucan and Melvin G. Laboucan. They are accompanied by Mr. Stan Daniels, president, and Mr. Henry Houle, vice-president of the Metis Association of Alberta. I would ask these people to stand and receive the welcome of the members of this Assembly.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, 13 members of the adult development program of Grant MacEwan College, Cromdale campus, and their teacher Mr. Don Whalen. They are in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to introduce to you, sir, and to members of this Assembly, some 60 grade 12 students from the Lindsay Thurber Comprehensive High School in my constituency in the city of Red Deer. They are accompanied by at least two teachers, Neil Lund and Bruce Handcock, although I see other teachers present. Could I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House, please.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, sir, and to members of this Assembly, 26 students from William Roper Hull Home in my

constituency, including their mentors Judy Tucker, Nelda Penner, Lynn Girvin, Carolyn Anscliff, Sven Johnsson, and teachers Mr. Spence and Mr. Rishaug. They're in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and be welcomed by this House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, a young man from the city of Drumheller who is now attending university, Mr. Kary Hargreaves. Mr. Hargreaves comes from an excellent family in Drumheller which is very active in the business world there. Kary is accompanied by his father-in-law Paul Isinger, who is a former Drumhellerite presently living in Sherwood Park. I'm sure we will welcome to the Legislature these two men who are seated in your gallery this afternoon.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of the Attorney General**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the government of Alberta shares the strong concern of all our citizens in relation to the recent tragic death of a Calgary taxi driver. The board of review and the staff of Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, have asked us to express their sincere concern as well. The individual, who has been charged and is now in custody in this case, was absent without leave when he failed to return from a day parole from the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health will do a complete re-evaluation and re-assessment of the procedures, criteria, and safeguards that are used in the recommendations to the board of review having to do with those individuals held on Lieutenant-Governor's warrants. The Minister has also instructed her staff to review fully the exercise of discretion, which is granted by the Lieutenant-Governor acting upon the recommendation of the board, in granting day parole. A re-evaluation of all day parole is currently under way. No new day parole without supervision to those held on Lieutenant-Governor's warrants will be issued for a period of three months pending this review, at which time the board of review will assess this re-evaluation and make recommendations accordingly.

I will be discussing with my staff and the board of review what additional safeguards and procedures might be employed to assure that the valuable work of the board continues, and at the same time to provide protection to the public.

Both the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and I will report to this Assembly when the re-evaluation and re-assessment have been completed.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Patriation of the Constitution**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my first question of the Premier. It's with regard to the letter tabled in the Assembly yesterday. On page 2 of the letter is a copy of the resolution that was passed

in the Assembly. However, the deletion from that resolution is the amendment. I'd also like to refer to the remarks of the Government House Leader. He refers to the resolution with an amendment. I wonder if the Premier has noted the deletion. Secondly, what action does he foresee at the present time?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Little Bow would like — and we've noted the remarks that are there — after checking to confirm those facts, I'd be quite pleased to send a follow-up letter to the Prime Minister to confirm the precise wording as the *Hansard* record would reflect.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, we certainly appreciate that very much. As a follow-up question, I'd like to refer to page 3 of the letter and quote one of its sentences. The Premier is speaking to the Prime Minister:

If, in your opinion, the provinces have proposed too much or too little, perhaps the best solution would be to proceed with simple patriation as you suggested last spring.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: is the position outlined in that particular quote consistent with the amendment the Premier has so gratefully indicated he will refer to the Prime Minister?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's a very important matter, and I would like to describe what is involved. I'm going from memory because I do not have the letters in front of me, so these remarks are subject to checking. If the hon. members refer to the letter of a year ago from the Prime Minister on the matter of the constitution, they will recall that the Prime Minister set forth three options.

The first option was simple patriation without an amending formula. He went on to say in his letter that that patriation would occur and then there would be no amendments to the constitution without the concurrence of all 10 provinces. We, of course, as the hon. member will recall in debate, took the position and take the position that that is the existing law in Canada today, constitutionally, that amendments that affect the jurisdiction of the provinces cannot occur without the unanimous concurrence of both the federal government and all 10 provinces.

The second option outlined by the Prime Minister in his letter of last year was patriation plus an amending formula along the lines of the Victoria conference.

The third option had to do with patriation, the Victoria Charter amending formula, and such changes in the constitution as may be agreed to reflected in an attached draft proclamation.

What we were saying in this letter, and what we have been saying consistently, is that we have no objection to the first option of the Prime Minister contained in his letter of a year ago. It would simply move the situs of the constitution from Westminster to Canada without any agreement on any change in the amending formula, because we take the view there is an existing amending formula, that is the one established by precedents, which is the concurrence unanimously of all 11 governments. So what we are implying in that letter is, if there is strong feeling by other governments in Canada that patriation is all that important we could see patriation of the constitution without any changed amending formula, but

merely the re-establishment of the existing constitutional amending formula which would have a constitution with its situs in Canada, but no change affecting the jurisdictional powers of the provinces without the concurrence of all 10 provinces.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier for clarification. If I've understood the remarks correctly, the Premier at the present time feels that through precedent there is an existing amending formula and, in turn, the amendment to the resolution which indicates that patriation should not occur unless there is unanimous approval of an amending formula, and this approval should be given by all 10 provinces and the federal government. My question is [whether] on the basis of this precedent the Premier feels there is an amending formula existing in Canada and that he doesn't violate the content of that particular amendment and the original resolution?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, our position [which] the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and I have been discussing is precisely the fact that there now exists an amending formula in Canada, as I have just described. Hence, if there is patriation, it's patriation with that amending formula intact. That is the only reason we feel we can still consider the first option of the Prime Minister, if it still exists, and not be contrary to the direction of this Legislative Assembly last November.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier indicate whether other provinces and the Prime Minister agree with this interpretation of an amending formula by precedent?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General may wish to expand these remarks, but I think it is fair to say that legally there is a clear difference of view on the matter. There are some governments and some constitutional legal advisers who hold to the same view as the government of the province of Alberta that I have just expressed. There are other views to the effect that an amendment affecting provinces could be made without the unanimous concurrence of all 10 provinces. We have had legal advice, which I think the Attorney General described to the House in a general way during debate last fall, that supports the contention we have taken. I can't define, because I don't think we really have gone that far, the respective legal positions of the other 10 governments involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A final supplementary on this question to the Premier. Would the Premier undertake in the letter that will go to the Prime Minister for clarification also to explain, or refer to, this existing precedent and relate it to the amendment as such?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, certainly we'd have no objection to confirmation of that position, to make it crystal clear that that's where we stand: if there is patriation, it would take place only with what we interpret to be the existing constitutional formula. Otherwise we would oppose patriation *per se*. Certainly we'd be happy to do this. I think our existing

correspondence has already set out that position quite clearly, but if we're going to have a follow-up letter relative to the amendment, we see no harm in reconfirming it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of the importance placed by the government of Alberta on the question of the precedent that an amending formula in actual fact is in place now, can the Premier advise the Assembly whether the constitutional experts consulted by the government of Alberta on this important matter are unanimous in their view that in fact there is a precedent in place?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to refer that question to the Attorney General.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to appear flippant, but any large group of lawyers cannot be expected to be absolutely unanimous on any one point. Suffice it to say that the opinions we have are fully consistent with the view that has been expressed by the Premier and others on this issue. That is not to say that the reasons for those conclusions are necessarily always the same. What I'm saying is that we have sometimes arrived at the conclusion for different reasons.

But the assessment that the amending formula is in fact the concurrence of 11 governments when it comes to basic issues like the distribution of powers is, in our judgment, beyond debate. There are some provinces, perhaps the Premier alluded to this, that for their own reasons perhaps may be ignoring the legal advice they may have. But that is a motive I would not want to lay at the feet of any particular province, or even speculate as to the reasons.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then to the hon. Attorney General, not as to how the legal advisers of the government walk this perilous route to a conclusion but whether in the advice from the legal experts, constitutional experts — and I presume the government would be going beyond just seeking the advice of lawyers but other constitutional experts as well — there is unanimity in the conclusion that in fact we do have a precedent now in place for amending the Canadian constitution.

MR. FOSTER: I'm not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member means by a precedent "in place". I think I dealt adequately with the question when I said that the advice we have, and we have that advice from inside Alberta and of course elsewhere in Canada clearly, is fully consistent with the position this government has taken *qua* the capacity of the federal government to unilaterally amend the constitution in matters that affect the rights of the provinces. As I say, I would have to go back and review all the opinions to be sure there was not some minor qualification placed in some opinion. But my memory is that the advice we have from all areas is fully consistent with the position that has been taken.

Mental Patient Day Parole

MR. R. SPEAKER: My second question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health with

regard to the legal judgment that was passed on Christian Kjeldsen in 1972. At that time it was indicated that he was criminally insane and that the necessary psychiatric treatment was not available in Canada. I was wondering when the board of review conducted its last examination of his case and what the circumstances were that led to his being released on day parole.

MISS HUNLEY: I can't give the hon. member the exact date on which the board of review last met to discuss it. I do know that he has been under intensive treatment at Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, and that the board of review in consultation with the officials at the Alberta Hospital, Edmonton felt it would not be dangerous for him to have day paroles. He was allowed to leave in order to seek a job opportunity.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Were any supervisory conditions applied to Mr. Kjeldsen's day parole?

MISS HUNLEY: The board of review allowed the discretion of the staff at Alberta Hospital, so Mr. Kjeldsen was allowed to leave at first to seek opportunity for work, under supervision, and of course he was allowed additional freedoms around the premises of the hospital prior to that. Then he had been allowed to go downtown on four occasions, unescorted, with a check back by telephone. On three occasions there was no problem, and on the fourth occasion he failed to return.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Was this patient on any medication that was necessary for controlled behavior?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't have in my possession the actual treatment that was being undertaken at the hospital, but I do know and have been assured by the staff there that the treatment was considered intensive.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Does the minister have with her the information as to when this person was first allowed to have day parole?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have that, although I have asked for a detailed, almost day-by-day report, which will be provided to me as soon as possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on this matter. As a matter of information, when patients such as this do not return after day parole what steps are taken or what directives are given to local police, RCMP, public conveyance people, and so on after the patient is found missing?

MISS HUNLEY: I think every opportunity and every possible means of securing the patient are undertaken. Of course the police are routinely advised because they are now in breach of the Lieutenant-Governor's warrant, the review board's agreement, in breach of their parole. Everything possible is done in order to take them again into custody.

head: **POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier that I find rather distasteful. I would like to ask the Premier if he has had the opportunity to read in yesterday's [unofficial] Hansard the remark the hon. Member for Vegreville made relating to our native people.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have, with regret, read the remarks. I was intending to rise in Orders of the Day with regard to the remarks and disassociate the government from them. I spoke to the hon. Member for Vegreville just prior to coming into the House when the matter came to my attention, and received his assurance that the comments with regard to the native people of Alberta were not intended in the way they were expressed. I'm sure he may wish to rise on a point of privilege and respond to my discussion with him.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: With the consent of the Assembly there is no reason this can't be done during the question period.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I spoke on the throne speech I covered several areas and, without realizing that somebody might feel hurt or anything, I thought I was speaking an opinion of my own as we exercise democracy in this House. However, when I got a clipping from the paper today, some of the remarks there were a little alarming, not even meant or said the way they were in, and I feel that if there is any group or individual that feels I was trying to insinuate anything on them, this is not right. That was not my intention.

Actually, it's the contrary. When I joined this political party, one reason I did join was because of the Premier's stand at that time, the leader of the party, that all people are equal regardless of their race, creed, or religion. That was one of the reasons I was enticed into joining that party.

Once again, in case any individual or group feels there were slanderous remarks, this was not my intention and I would withdraw them if anybody feels so.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if I may move, seconded by my colleague Mr. R. Speaker, the Member for Little Bow — I would not like to read the section; I would like to ask that section 84.6 be struck from the records of [unofficial] Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly this could be dealt with on another occasion. We're going to be getting quite far beyond the intent of the question period. I would suggest that perhaps the hon. member might give notice in the usual way, and have that motion dealt with in the ordinary way.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**
(continued)**Wolf Control**

MR. STROMBERG: [Inaudible] the opportunity to question the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. My question to him, sir, is: have members of his department ever monitored the number of wildlife that have been lost per year to the wolf population in Alberta, especially the fawns and calves of both moose and elk, and is the minister giving consideration to implementing the recommendations of the Alberta Fish & Game Association as to wolf control on the east slopes?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in answering the last part of the hon. member's question to start with, we are reviewing the recommendation just made this past weekend at the Alberta Fish & Game Association's annual meeting. Relative to the other concern as to whether we're monitoring what may in fact be happening on Crown land, I'm not able to respond at this time. I'll have to attempt to find that for you and report back.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware there is a wolf poisoning program currently being undertaken in the Crowsnest Pass on the King Ranch?

MR. ADAIR: Not specifically, Mr. Speaker.

Solar Energy

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. It concerns the sun, which is not a depleting source of energy. Has the University of Calgary applied to Alberta Housing for assistance to build an experimental solar heated house in or near Ellerslie?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a member of the staff of the University of Alberta had been in to see me on several occasions with the possibility of the Alberta Housing Corporation assisting in the planning and design of a house related to the use of solar energy in the Ellerslie area. Under its grant program, if my memory serves me correctly, the department did indeed give a grant to this particular project. I believe the grant was of the nature of \$5,000.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. With reference to the design of the house for which the \$5,000 was spent, is Alberta Housing now going to give additional assistance to build the house that has been designed?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, to my recollection the parties involved in the project haven't come in to discuss with me, or the Alberta Housing Corporation to my knowledge, the possibility of using provincial government funds to assist in the construction of the house.

Rural and Native Housing

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. In view of the memorandum of November 29, 1974 setting out a target of some 200 homes between November 1, '74 and October 31, 1975, and in view of the agreement of February 16, 1976 setting an additional target of 450 Section 40 units for 1976 — these are units under the rural and native housing program — my question is: can the minister explain to the Assembly why the government has fallen so far short of achieving the targets set out in these agreements?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the member across the way is speaking about the rural and native housing program. Just to review the situation briefly — and I want to suggest it is my intention to review the matter more thoroughly during the course of the budget debate — I would like to suggest that an agreement was signed between the federal government, the provincial government, and ANDCO as the third party, I believe in December of 1974, to undertake to build housing under the rural and native housing program which would be financed 75 per cent by the federal government and 25 per cent by the provincial government.

In any major program as such, which is identified and isolated to communities of 2,500 people and less, there is a certain gestation period. In building housing in northern Alberta, one must recognize that the Alberta Housing Corporation has to go through the normal approval process, as any other developer. The approval processes are not necessarily easy, and are complex and time-delaying. As a result, it has taken a period of a year and a half to two years, during which many of these problems have been overcome.

There have been problems associated with communications with the local Metis housing committees, if you wish. But again I wish to suggest that most of these problems during the last two years have been overcome. We are now in a position whereby we are producing housing at a satisfactory rate.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what the obstacles were in the approval process in these remote communities? Also, what were the obstacles in the last two years in communication between ANDCO and the other levels of government, in view of the fact that rather ambitious targets were set out and our record to date has been dismal to say the least?

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had taken the opportunity of issuing a news release on November 23, 1976, issuing an overview of the rural and native housing program. If the hon. member wishes to have a copy of the overview, I am prepared to give it to him now or a little later. But if he wishes me to spend some 15 or 20 minutes reading the attachment to the news release, I would be very willing to do so.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. I didn't ask him to read the

news release. I would ask the hon. minister what the obstacles were.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, all the obstacles are outlined in the news overview, and I'm prepared to give it to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member would like to refer to 171 of *Beauchesne*, it rules out questions on matters which are public knowledge.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the rather modest progress we have made in the last two years — and that's putting it in the kindest light — is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what the target is and whether or not we can expect to achieve that target in 1977?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member recognizes the nature of capital budget commitments by Alberta Housing and the fact that they come to this Assembly by way of cash requirements for any particular year. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Housing Corporation has the opportunity of precommitting projects in the senior citizen area, public housing area, rural and native housing program area, and many other areas, then undertaking like any developer to go through the process of acquiring land, getting subdivision approval, indeed going through a very difficult process to get subdivision approval in some areas.

I indicated earlier that the Alberta Housing Corporation functions like any other normal developer. It doesn't have any additional privileges beyond the normal developer in dealing with local authorities and regional planning commissions. I should indicate that when the program was first introduced — the first budgetary year where a major allocation or commitment was made was in the year 1975. To the best of my recollection the commitment in '75 and up to '75 was 220 units for the rural and native housing program. The second year's commitment was last year when again the Alberta Housing Corporation committed itself to attempt to construct 307 units for a total of 527 units in two years. Again, during the budgetary process I will attempt to indicate to the House the nature and extent of the commitments this year under the program.

The success is improving constantly. Indeed, I can suggest to the House that progress is such that we anticipate — even though, as I made known to the press before, to date the completions were 84, 56 were under construction, 59 had gone to tender. Indeed, the corporation had purchased 100 lots through communities across the north, and a considerable number of tenders were ready which will be announced during the next couple of weeks. Beside that we have options on land and land under negotiation to the extent of some 1,238 acres across northern communities.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable amount of activity. In just the short span of two years, I believe progress in terms of supplying rural and native housing, not only in this program but in all programs, is nothing short of remarkable, recognizing the conditions and the difficulties under which this program got going.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I think there are other people who think it's remarkable too, but not necessarily in the same way the hon. minister does. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to advise the Assembly what the target date is now to catch up to the commitments which were already made in the 1974, '75, '76, '77 years.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, again it's very difficult to put an actual objective analysis to a target date, because indeed as I indicated earlier the nature of delivery is improving considerably. We are to a large degree subservient to the local approval process and the regional planning approval process, and you can't build a thing until you have a lot. In some cases you have to supply the services. So some of the problems associated with land assembly and lot servicing look very encouraging and hopeful. As a result we anticipate a banner year in the next year.

However, I want to qualify that by saying that it's predicated on the fact that the process of subdivision approval and the process of getting approval from local authorities to proceed with construction is not necessarily cut and dried, and that indeed we do anticipate additional difficulties in this area. So it's not possible for me to identify an actual target for the Assembly today. However, I am prepared to suggest that we will be providing more homes under the rural native housing program and all the Metis housing programs during the course of 1977 than we have in 1976 and 1975.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Housing. In view of the fact that the concerns expressed by the hon. minister in answering my question were obviously problems that existed in 1974, 1975, and 1976 when this latest agreement was signed, can the minister advise why these targets were set, in view of the fact that the concerns were obviously there at the time? Is it the minister's view that the targets were unrealistic when they were set, that they could not possibly be achieved?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I want to say is that it is very difficult to catch up in one or two years with over 50 years of total neglect in regard to housing for Metis.

The second thing I want to suggest is that a real honest and determined effort is being made. When targets are established, or if you wish, commitments are made, the commitments are made in respect to the fact that the federal government had indeed laid out a national program, a 10-year program — I believe it indicated 50,000 housing units across the nation in 10 years, therefore suggesting that in the province of Alberta they would average 4,000 to 5,000 units in total or somewhere between 400 and 500 units a year.

Now it was certainly recognized that it was not possible to provide, over a 10-year period, 400 or 500 houses a year on a straight line basis. And it was recognized without a shadow of a doubt by people who are knowledgeable in the area of construction, particularly housing construction, that you'd start fairly modestly, build up to a peak, then taper off, or level off. Indeed it was also recognized, as is recognized in any program, that unless reasonable targets are es-

tablished there is a tendency to be slack on behalf of any developer, including the Alberta Housing Corporation.

So in terms of balancing all these matters it was felt that a commitment to something like 200 or 220 in the first year was appropriate in relation to the fact that we were anticipating a total of some 500 a year, as we were tied into the federal program over a 10-year period, and therefore moving up to 300 in the second year. Sure, we could have set targets much lower but then the efforts involved would have been considerably less. So we went to the process of establishing relatively higher targets, but again very modest compared to what was established by the federal government in this area, recognizing that indeed the higher the targets the greater the performance. I'm proud to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that's just exactly what's happening.

Rural Gas Co-ops

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Has the minister received correspondence from rural gas co-ops in regard to the announced April price increase in natural gas? If so, what is the nature of the correspondence?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that I certainly have. In November 1976 at the Federation of Gas Co-ops convention I was in a position and very happy to announce that we would be recommitting the natural gas price protection plan for a further three-year period beginning April 1, 1977, but recognizing at the same time the realities of the energy price structures that are the case not only in Canada but the world today, that there would have to be a substantial increase in the price of natural gas. By way of representation to the government and to their members of the Legislature a number of citizens have written both in their own words and in a large number of form letters to indicate they feel a high priority would be a worth-while consideration with respect to the kinds of priorities that would be necessary in the budget for the coming year. These are certainly being taken into account seriously by me and other members of the government.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received any reports of rural gas co-ops [being] forced to discontinue operations if they are hit with a further price increase?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, not on a concrete basis although there have been indications of worry with respect to this matter. Certainly those worries are ones that would be there, particularly if they've not had an opportunity as yet to compare the alternatives.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister or someone from his department met with the gas federation regarding the gas price increases?

DR. WARRACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have met with the chairman of the Federation of Gas Co-ops along with my colleague the hon. Minister of Consumer and

Corporate Affairs. I also look forward to another meeting which is scheduled shortly.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the recent submission of the Federation of Gas Co-ops, is the government prepared to look at the proposal that gas co-ops have access to capital at low interest rates, basically similar to the principle of the REA revolving fund?

DR. WARRACK: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are ahead of the hon. member on that matter. In fact on January 17 in Grande Prairie I announced that we would be in a position by way of grant to modify the financial formula of support, so that for \$4,500 per user approved costs there would be 90 per cent grant above that figure for the construction of rural gas programs. Therefore that very major and helpful action to a number of rural gas co-ops across Alberta has already been taken.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. The minister misunderstood my question. The position a number of rural gas co-op people have raised is that on that portion of the money they have to finance — not the money that is worked out in grants available under various formulas — has any consideration been given to access to a revolving fund similar to the REA's?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I did not misunderstand the hon. member's question at all. He misunderstood my answer. As I mentioned, in dealing with this matter we came to the conclusion that major assistance — by the way the program of additional financial assistance is retroactive to the beginning of the rural gas program — has already been provided right now as a result of the announcement I made in Grande Prairie. It was our judgement that it would be more helpful to have that assistance right now, rather than waiting into the future for some additional kind of support such as the hon. member suggested. So the action with respect to the additional financial assistance — certainly I think the hon. member will appreciate that it is a major amount of assistance. Whether it's in one way or another, it still adds up to dollars. Certainly the judgment was that to assist them now would be the right course of action, and we took it.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister had an opportunity to assess the financial stability of other gas co-ops in our sister provinces?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, that's very easy because we are the only province with rural gas available to farmers, and I think everyone is pleased that they live here.

Landlord and Tenant Legislation

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I have had several inquiries. Is the minister in a position to inform this Assembly if he or his department is considering changing the rent regulations or rent control by giving tenants notice to vacate

from 30 days to 90 days? If so, is the minister considering bringing it before this session?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Institute of Law Research and Reform has given us a report on matters relating to landlord and tenant, and that is one of the subjects covered. At the moment the government is considering that report. It is my intention to be able to bring forward legislation as soon as possible.

Rents — Fort McMurray

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Yesterday I asked the minister if he could report on the Athabasca Realty application before the rent regulation office for increases in rent. Can the minister report to the House, please?

MR. HARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand Athabasca Realty has issued notices of increases in rent. They involve approximately 500 units. The application has been given to the rent regulation officer as they exceed the guideline of 9 per cent. There is a waiting period of 15 days before the matter can be dealt with by the rent regulation officer, and as soon as that 15 days has passed the matter will be dealt with. The time is to permit the tenants involved to present a statement of interest to the officer.

Egg Quotas

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. What is the current situation with respect to negotiations with the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency with reference to the egg production quotas?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Egg and Fowl Marketing Board has been negotiating with the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency for several months now with respect to the level of layers in what we refer to as the unregulated flocks in the province, that is those flocks of less than 300 birds. There has been a difference of agreement between our provincial board and the national board with respect to the number of dozens of eggs produced by the unregulated layers. In my opinion, it has resulted in a substantial decrease in the actual egg quota that the province of Alberta and our board has. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we are importing something in the neighborhood of 5,000 cases of eggs per week at the present time as compared to 1,000 in a traditional situation over the course of the last several years.

My indications are that counts have been taken of actual layer numbers and that the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency and the National [Farm] Products Marketing Council will be considering those new numbers as a result of the counts. There is a strong possibility that additional quota will be allocated about April 1.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Are the new numbers the result of a survey of the small producers, those under 200?

MR. MOORE: Yes, that is correct, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's those under 300 who are being surveyed and actually counted. The difficulty is that the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency has used as criteria for determining the number of laying hens in unregulated flocks the number of placements by hatcheries into Alberta. As everyone would know, it isn't every laying pullet or chick placed in Alberta that turns out to be a laying hen. Many of them are slaughtered for meat and otherwise. So, that's rather poor criteria to use in determining how many dozens of eggs might be produced in unregulated flocks. At the request of our board, they are doing an actual count, not of the entire province but certainly a sample to get better handle on how many layers there are in the unregulated flocks.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there is some dispute between the national board and our board as to the numbers of dozens of eggs per year that are produced in our unregulated flocks. The figure is close to 19 dozen eggs per year per chicken in regulated flocks. For purposes of quota, they are considering that it would be 14 dozen per year in unregulated flocks. But our review, quite frankly, is that the production in unregulated flocks may be somewhat less than 14 dozen, perhaps closer to 10 or 11 dozen per year.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Will the increased quotas for Alberta, if granted by CEMA, mean a larger quota for those producers who presently have a quota of eggs, or more quotas being issued to other producers?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that matter is partly up to our provincial board, but I've had discussions with our provincial egg marketing board on more than one occasion relative to providing a quota to people who want to start in the business or expand from an unregulated flock to a regulated one. While I don't have that data with me, I did receive assurances from the board that they would, by regulation or otherwise, establish some maximum on the growth of regulated flocks so there might be a better opportunity for people to get into the business than there has been in the past.

I can't at this time provide any figures with respect to the number of new producers who have gone into the business during the course of the past while, except to say that it's very few because of the difficulties of obtaining new quota. But I think it's fairly safe to assume that if we are able to increase our quota we will have some additional new producers, not just an increase in the production allowed to existing producers.

I should say as well on the subject, Mr. Speaker, it's probably really not fair to suggest we're getting an increase in quota. We've been asking for — and what we hope will happen is — better recognition of the number of laying birds we have, which will allow us to produce more eggs. In other words, the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency is now saying we have substantially more layers than we think we have. That's not really an increase in quota but rather a better method of establishing the number of layers we have, because a quota is not based on dozens of eggs, Mr. Speaker, it's based on numbers of layers.

MR. TAYLOR: One further . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We've run over the time for the question period, although we did have an interruption in the question period, and I've already recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. With the consent of the House perhaps he might ask his question, and perhaps we could conclude the question period with that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be more interested in putting a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, but since you've ruled out the hon. Member for Drumheller on that question I'll save it for tomorrow when we can once again discuss the question of CEMA.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent of the House to move a motion without notice respecting some of the remarks that were made yesterday, and I would move that passages 83.18 to 84.19 be struck from [unofficial] Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is referring to the 'blues' copy of Hansard in which the lines are so numbered.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which are they again?

MR. SPEAKER: It appears that some hon. members have not heard the numbers.

MR. BATIUK: [Not recorded] the numbers are 83.18 to 84.19.

MR. SPEAKER: I should mention to the Assembly that I'm not aware of any precedent for this kind of step, and since it goes contrary to the standing order in respect to *Hansard*, it of course requires unanimous consent.

I haven't checked the text. It could conceivably be that the expunging of the passages referred to may leave the rest of the text in need of some changing. If hon. members wish to pass the motion unanimously, I would hope that the *Hansard* Editor might have discretion to make any consequential changes in the text which might be necessary to give effect to the wishes of the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I also rise on a point of privilege in connection with *Hansard*. On Tuesday, March 1 on page 49 we read, bills 201, 202, and then 205. We caught this in the 'blues' that came around to our office, and Mr. Williams took up the correction, but apparently it was not corrected and has been printed in *Hansard* as Bill 205. It is obviously 203, as we already have 205 right under it. Therefore I would move that 5 be expunged and 3 be put in its place.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure it won't take a formal motion of the House to achieve the hon. member's purpose.

In order to continue the variety of this afternoon's proceedings, may we now revert to Introduction of Visitors for the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**
(reversion)

MR. TESOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am most pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 50 students from the Alberta Vocational [Centre] in Lac La Biche. They are accompanied by their teachers Ray Ewaskiw, Joanne Sehn, Tom Pawlik, and Howard Livesley. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, might Question 103 stand, please.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns stand and retain their place on the Order Paper: 101, 102, 104, 105, and 106.

[Motion carried]

107. Moved by Mr. Mandeville:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the name of each legal firm engaged by the Alberta Housing Corporation during the period April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, including the name of the specific lawyer or lawyers dealt with in each case;
- (2) the nature of the service supplied by each legal firm referred to in (1), including the amount of the fee charged for each such service.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, since we've started a variety in the House this afternoon, possibly I could get leave of the House to make a small amendment to this motion. The amendment would read: "After the words 'Alberta Housing Corporation' add 'and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation'."

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree? It's rather unusual perhaps for the mover of a motion to move its amendment, but I'm sure that what the hon. member wishes is simply to change the text of the motion, and that the House is agreeing to that.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly then agree to motion no. 107 as amended?

[Motion as amended carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to adopt the following practices for the duration of this Legislature:

- (1) When a ministerial statement is made in the House the minister shall, prior to or at the time of making the statement, deliver two copies of the text of the statement to the Leader of the Opposition.
- (2) Upon the day of introduction of a government bill the member introducing it shall present to the Assembly for filing in the Legislature Library a copy of all studies, reports, and other documents upon which the principle and detail of the bill are justified.
- (3) There shall be attached to each government bill an explanatory memorandum which shall set out the purpose of the bill, its practical effect, and the impact on previous legislation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the resolution, I would like to say that it is certainly not a controversial suggestion to the Legislature. But we as opposition members feel it is very important at this point in time. I would like to say it is the first of a series of such suggestions we would like to make to the Legislature. We would like to look at the possibility of private members' bills being given greater consideration, and possibly votes taken on those respective bills.

The other area we are looking at is the area of bills which could be referred to the select and standing committees for greater and more intensive consideration by the Legislature. We feel this resolution will give support to the role of the opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: They need it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We certainly need it when we are left with four. There is no question about that. As earlier oppositions have asked for certain privileges and rules of the House that would assist them, here at this point in time we are objectively asking for the same kind of consideration.

But in a resolution such as this, we feel it will help every member of the Legislature — not only the opposition, but every member, members of the backbenches of the government — because it will give them more information to reflect upon the decisions and initiatives taken in this Legislature. I'd like to say the resolution is not brought in with the intent of attacking some of the present rules, regulations, or policies. We feel it is an attempt to make the Legislature more effective.

In light of those comments, I would then like to comment on the three different areas.

In the first clause we ask that a copy of a ministerial statement be made available at the time of or, if possible, prior to the statement. I would like to say that before the Attorney General made his statement to the House today, he sent a copy of his release over to me. I certainly appreciated that gesture very, very much because, one, it gave me the ability to interpret it fully, and two, if as members in the Assembly we wish to react to, compliment, or whatever the case may be, that particular statement, we have time to do

just that type of thing. We feel this would not be a difficult thing for a minister to do and certainly could be easily complied with.

The second clause of this motion may be a little more difficult and may take more effort on the part of the ministers and the government. But we feel the principle is important enough to support at this point in time. We are asking in that second clause that a compendium of background information be made available by filing it with the Legislature Library. We feel when a new policy statement or a new initiative is introduced by government, background material must certainly have been used. If it is a suggestion they have just picked out of the air and presented to the Assembly, well, that could be the compendium as such. But we feel this would certainly assist us, and every other member and minister also, in assessing and being able to criticize any policy or legislation in a positive manner.

Earlier there were some comments with regard to the money and our research staff. We feel it's rather a waste of time for a research staff to be running around the Legislature Building, phoning ministers' offices, trying to obtain different reports through various means. It's a total waste of time.

We feel if the minister — I'm sure that material is accumulated when a decision is made — presented it to the Legislature Library, it would be there and then we could get on with the necessary critical analysis. That, Mr. Speaker, is certainly the number one priority of research staff.

You will also note that there is discretion in the wording of this second clause. The minister can make a judgment as to what he wishes to file with the Legislature Library. We are not saying it has to be completely inclusive, without the exclusion of any paper. Nor do we reserve the judgment to say that if a certain document is left out, we can continually criticize because they forgot this or that. We leave that discretion to the minister. We feel that through experience and over a period of time there will be an understanding as to what should and should not be placed in the Legislature Library for effective analysis and discussion.

Now we often ask, well, where do ideas such as this come from? It is not an original idea. One of the requests we have made to one of our research personnel is to examine the procedures in all the legislatures across Canada, in the British House, and in any other place that he wishes to contact. He has found these two ideas have worked very effectively in the Legislature of Ontario. In the British Parliament in London the same practice is in effect, has worked very, very effectively, and has helped the legislators to a great extent.

One of the concerns we have determined in doing this research with various legislatures is that not only the governments but also the legislators are very concerned about who gets involved in the decision-making process. Many of the legislators and parliaments are attempting to come up with various means and ways of getting the member of the legislature or parliament more involved or more informed. We feel this is certainly one way of doing it.

Just as a matter of information, a research paper was done on the British Parliament. It found that most decisions or changes in bills were made by ministerial initiatives and not by the backbenchers.

The figure quoted was that 89 per cent of any changes that occurred in the legislature or the parliament after a bill was introduced were initiated by the minister and not by the backbenchers. They have tried in Ontario and in the British Parliament to do something about that by presenting better information and better involvement of the MP or the MLA. That's the reason for the second clause. We feel it is reasonable and certainly one that can add a lot to the procedure and the ability and the involvement of the members of this Assembly.

The third clause is very straightforward. It asks for a greater explanation of the bill. There are three parts, as we can note from the resolution. We want the purpose set out, its practical effect, and the impact on previous legislation.

Now in the bills before us at the present time, we note there are explanatory notes. But if you quickly page through those explanatory notes, they don't explain very much. They are in legal terms, and terms that maybe even the politician or the member of the Legislature doesn't understand. But certainly when you send this out to the general public, they haven't the slightest idea what the legal language or the language in those particular bills says. To explain it to the general public, usually as a member of the Legislature, you have to write a summary and put the background information in. We're saying that when a minister or a member of the Legislature introduces a bill, he should have that kind of information, and I am sure in a very short period of time he could summarize and make it available.

MR. GHITTER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. If we went along with this proposal, I'm wondering if the hon. member would like a rattle with the legislation to assist him in interpreting it.

MR. SPEAKER: I would question whether that was a rattling good point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree. Thank you for taking care of the interruption.

MR. FARRAN: Gets everybody alert.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The hon. member feels we should all be spoon-fed, and we should all sit in the back rooms or down in the Legislature Library and do research and find these documents and write summaries. Well that's not what we're here for. Maybe the hon. member comes up to read novels on the backbenches, or to read something else besides the legislation. Maybe he spends a lot of time in his legal practice reading the bills, and maybe it isn't necessary in the Assembly. But some of us feel our time could be better spent by not digging up this background information, because our decisions must be on the policies, the initiatives, and what we're doing ahead, not in a backward manner.

AN HON. MEMBER: He gets paid for it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: But anyway, if we look through these bills, Mr. Speaker, we note that explanatory notes are usually very short and lack the type of substance we certainly need in them. Most of them say, "refer to the old bill" and the sections say, "the

old section presently reads". As I go through all these bills, that's about what explanatory notes amount to. Not very much more than that. So I think they fall very short of what we feel is necessary in the explanation of a bill.

I'd like to say clearly that not only are members of the Legislature involved in reading and studying the bills, but also the general public. We as members can say, well we can do the background study, we have research money. Maybe that's true, maybe we can. But I think it's a lot of time wasted. We send out bills to many different people across the province and say, give us your comments or give us your criticism. The first thing they say is, give us all the background, we don't understand the language, we don't know what's really happening. Well, then we have to go through that particular procedure and take it on as a responsibility.

We feel that a minister who is aware and understands what's going on would not find it an impossible task to provide that information. We feel as a group in the Legislature and as members of the Legislature that that is only part of the basic policy and thrust we have put into this Legislature under the title of the public right to know. It's one way we can inform the general population about bills, initiatives, legislative or in resolution, in the best proper manner. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is very, very important.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly move this resolution and urge the members to support these changes in our procedure. We feel they're sound and merit the consideration of every member. We intentionally — and I'd like to add this in my concluding remarks — we made this resolution less controversial than some of the other suggestions we have at later occasions in this Assembly . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Earlier and later.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . later in the Assembly. And we feel that on that basis we could receive the support of the Legislature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Little Bow was optimistic if he suggested the motion being brought in isn't controversial. I find it hard to believe that the opposition would even attempt to pass this kind of legislation in the Legislature. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's almost as if the Member for Little Bow and his group are blaming this government for the fact that they have a shambled ranks over there. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was so shambled today that the Leader of the Opposition wasn't even in his chair. Now he may have had some good reason for not being there.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Member. . .

MR. COOKSON: It's nice to know that the member from Fort Saskatchewan is back from pulling teeth, too. I know it's difficult for an opposition with a shambled ranks to try to get on top of the type of legislation being brought in by a pretty progressive government. But I don't think they should come in here and cry and rattle — what was it they were rattling? The Member for Calgary Buffalo suggested . . .

MR. McCRAE: Their buffalo bones.

MR. COOKSON: . . . their buffalo bones or whatever and cry because they're not prepared to react immediately to legislation that comes in here. I fail to understand that.

I think the Member for Little Bow, who along with several other members of the opposition is actually a senior member in the Legislature, knows full well and is very capable. He understands the legislation. The former minister understands the procedure we have to go through to prepare legislation for this Assembly. It is just beyond me why all of a sudden the member finds it difficult to interpret what is before him.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think it was this government which contributed a major amount to the opposition, because of their shambled ranks, to go through research and to assist them in preparing their presentation, I think something in the area of \$150,000. Hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, do you remember? I think it was something like that. Highlands, I'm sorry.

MR. KING: You won't get an answer out of me, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: And then to suggest that we should go a little bit further and do what is asked in this motion is beyond me.

I find that some of the members of the opposition are able to rise immediately and react to presentations in the House. I find that in the question period they're very effective, and that's important. I think we need a good strong opposition. But to come in here and ask government to support this kind of motion is simply to sanction the fact that they're just a little too lazy to get off their butts and find out what is going on.

From the preamble, Mr. Speaker, I think you can assume I'm suggesting that we vote the motion down. The first part of the motion says:

When a ministerial statement is made in the House the minister shall, prior to or at the time of making the statement, deliver two copies of the text of the statement to the Leader of the Opposition.

I don't know why two. You've got four members over there. They should perhaps have one each. But I ask the question why, when I read that. I don't know whether it was ever done during the Social Credit era in this province. It's very doubtful. If I remember correctly there were only three, four, five, maybe six at the most in the opposition. They did a tremendously good job in the House and certainly were very effective out on the hustings. That's the reason there are only four or five over there now.

MR. ADAIR: No research.

MR. KING: Don't say "no research", Al.

MR. COOKSON: The second section says:

Upon the day of introduction of a government bill the member introducing it shall present to the Assembly for filing in the . . . Library a copy of all studies, reports, and other documents upon which the principle and detail of the Bill are justified.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we commence prepar-

ing legislation the day we start the session the year before, and perhaps long before that. We're preparing in effect, the kind of legislation that is the sort of thing we expect the people in the province will accept. It's the duty of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, to give us some guidance and direction.

What I'm saying is that the preparatory time in preparing legislation is a long process in most cases. It requires a lot of hearings, a lot of feedback, a tremendous number of documents. For example, I've seen documents tabled in this Legislature that one had to take out in a wheelbarrow. I'm not sure whether this was the intent of the Member for Little Bow. I don't think I'm exaggerating when I say there's a tremendous amount of preparation in bringing legislation before the House.

I don't know what the former government did, Mr. Speaker, with regard to preparation of legislation. Was it a one-man outfit, or were two involved? But I can assure you that in the present government it is a long-lasting process. There isn't one backbencher, frontbencher, sidebencher, or whatever who doesn't have an opportunity to put some input into the kind of constructive legislation we have in this province. This is a time-consuming process. I'm not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Little Bow is asking for this or whether, because it wasn't a part of the process in the former government, he's missed something in his training. But this is the process we go through.

For example, we'll be — and I put this in quotation marks — "tabling the planning act" this spring. Without being critical of our own government, it's been a long process. I'm not sure we're through with it yet. It may be something that will have to be finalized in the fall. But certainly the amount of input and the time consumption in this process, to table all this before the Legislature, would just be an impossible duty.

Number three:

There shall be attached to each government bill an explanatory memorandum which shall set out the purpose of the bill, its practical effect, and the impact on previous legislation.

I've simply put down here that this is the opposition's job. That's what you're there for: to look at the legislation that comes into this House. We've gone through the process three, four, five, six, seven — I've seen up to 10 draft forms before they come before the House. It's the duty and responsibility of the opposition to take that legislation and the \$150,000 that we give the opposition to analyse the legislation, get their research people going, and come back in the House through the first, second, and third readings and critically examine the impact it is going to have on the people in Alberta. That's their responsibility, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

I don't think, member from Fort Saskatchewan, you should abrogate that responsibility. You're just going to have to stay in this House more, spend more time going through this legislation, and come up with some constructive criticism.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the opposition come up with some good amendments and changes acceptable to the government, we will make them. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that

we simply vote this down and save the Legislature a lot of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate by saying the basic intent of the resolution before us today is to let the Alberta people know what is going on with their government and what is going on in this Legislature.

When we go back and look at some of the records, Mr. Speaker, of some of the pious speeches the present Premier made when he was Leader of the Opposition, when we talk about the desire for open government, when we talk about the desire for decentralization, when we talk about all these beautiful things that the leader of the opposition at that time told us we needed in this Legislature, there has been a complete turnabout. There has been a complete centralization of power by this government. There has been a complete move to secrecy. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are trying to avoid. This is why we are bringing a resolution to this Legislature which is supposed to be the "centre of the action".

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can hand us his line of blarney about the money they have given us — and this government forgets that money just happens to be the taxpayers' — to promote the democratic process. I would like to remind the hon. members they have a civil service of almost 30,000 people who can provide them with the research staff and the information.

That bureaucracy, compliments of this government, is growing and growing and growing and growing. So the member doesn't have to stand in his place, Mr. Speaker, and give us this holier-than-thou thing about the amount of money the official and the unofficial opposition are receiving to do the public's work — to do the public's work, Mr. Speaker. Now I know it's fine to run the closed shop that the government is running, because they have this complete arrogance towards this Legislature, as exemplified by the Premier never being here, hon. member — practically never being here hon. Member for Lacombe. So don't give me any of that malarkey.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to give us the information on how the decisions are made. I would like to inform the hon. Member for Lacombe that in spite of the number of times bills and legislation go through caucus, the number of times legislation comes before this House on first reading, second reading, committee, and third reading, there are many times, Mr. Speaker, that that legislation is amended on third reading in this very House, after all this procedure, after we've gone through the procedure of bringing into caucus several times, five times, 10 times, three or four times in the House, and it's still been amended. I would like to inform the hon. Member for Lacombe that we as members of this Legislature should sit in this Legislature with the idea that no law is so good that it can't be improved upon.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

To make these decisions, hon. Member for Lacombe, this is why we are asking for this information. It's fine to do a snow job on the opposition, to bring some legislation into this House on a Friday — great

volumes and in great numbers — and Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday we start the debate on those bills. Now if that isn't trying to snuff the opposition, I don't know what is. But I will say to the hon. Member for Lacombe: we used to play those little games when I was on that side of the House. But two wrongs don't make a right. Two wrongs don't make a right. So in our honest desire to do our job on this side of the House, we are asking that this information be supplied.

The hon. Member for Lacombe especially will hear why we are bringing bills and resolutions in: for the public right to know the public's business. Because there's too much being done in this government by this government behind closed doors. If the hon. members of the honorable government were sincere in their effort to bring these things before the Legislature and before the people of Alberta, they would have allowed the chairman of the heritage trust act to be a non-government member. Hon. Member for Lacombe, did you stand in your place and support that resolution? No. The puppets had been advised they were not to rise.

I was quite upset, Mr. Speaker, when we voted on the resolution the hon. Leader of the Opposition brought in the other day, that nine members didn't have the intestinal fortitude to vote. Now I can forgive them if they were out looking after the constituents, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition is doing this afternoon, hon. Member for Lacombe. Then they would have had a legitimate excuse. But when they just sit out there behind the doors because they don't want to vote, I can't buy that.

DR. HOHOL: Oh, come off it, Walter.

DR. BUCK: Come off it, the hon. member from Belmont says, who also did a little turnabout on the Game Farm issue . . .

MR. DIACHUK: No turnabout.

DR. BUCK: . . . turnabout on the Game Farm issue when he found out from the letters to the editor and from his constituents . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep to the resolution.

DR. BUCK: . . . that they want the people of Alberta to keep the Game Farm in Alberta.

MR. DIACHUK: Who told you I changed my mind?

DR. BUCK: When those letters started coming to the editor we saw a little — I made a mistake, I said a 360 — a 180, a complete reversal.

MR. DIACHUK: You're talking about somebody else, not me, Walter.

DR. BUCK: I would like to say to the hon. members from Edmonton that they had better do a little bit of lobbying with their colleagues from Calgary because the people of Alberta want that Game Farm to stay here. [interjections]

But getting back to the issue, hon. minister responsible for Calgary affairs, getting back to the issue at hand, getting back to the resolution, we want the

information brought in with the legislation so we can also help to make the decisions in this House. You know it's a disease that grows on governments with large majorities. They become so cotton-picking arrogant that they think there's only one way to do things, and that's their way. In all humility [laughter] I would like to inform the hon. members on the government side that thereby you sow the seeds of your own destruction, with that type of arrogance. Because, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones stands in his place and tells us he hasn't received a large number of letters from rural gas co-ops . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He didn't say that.

DR. BUCK: . . . complaining about what is happening, I think he'd better go back and open all his mail. Because a government that will not listen to the people can very, very quickly be thrown out. A miracle happened in 1971, but that same miracle can happen in 1978 or 1979. I say to the hon. Deputy Premier: he's been around the political league a long time. He's been around a long time. He's been around since the Diefenbaker years, when the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker had the largest majority any prime minister has ever had. A short while after that, Mr. Speaker, he was 'long gone John'.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's still around though.

DR. BUCK: He's still around. But they are not the government and that is the lesson I am trying to bring to the honorable government members.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should know.

DR. BUCK: So, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is [ensure] that all members of the Assembly can do their job. I would also like to indicate to the hon. Member for Lacombe a thing or two about how the political process works.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your turn, John.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when we had the large majority, there were 55 to 10, and I know that with 55 members on the government side, the caucus is practically unworkable. The hon. Member for Lacombe doesn't have to hand me that line about how they make such momentous decisions in caucus, because you can't do it. You just can't get the input. You may get a 10-second clip in because that's all the time you have.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's the way you ran it.

DR. BUCK: When there are 70 members in the government caucus . . . I'm sure the hon. Member for Lacombe hasn't put 15 minutes worth of output in caucus since this session started. All you have to do is look at the straight mathematics of the thing. There just isn't time to do it, hon. Member for Lacombe. So don't give me that big speech about how much input you have in caucus [interjections] because the mechanics and the logistics are such that you don't have time.

So, Mr. Speaker, in our pursuits as the official

opposition, wanting the public to know what is going on in public business, we have brought this resolution on the Order Paper. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any time more apropos than now to let the public know what is going on in public business. When I made the flippant little remark to the hon. member from Medicine Hat, go home this weekend and listen to what your constituents are saying, and I said, higher taxes, higher gasoline, higher natural gas, that may have been a bit facetious, but that is exactly what they were saying. They want to know, hon. member from Medicine Hat, why these things are happening. Lay the documents before the Legislature. We are servants of this House. We are servants of the people of this province. And it is not to be done behind closed doors, because the way things are going right now, Mr. Speaker, this is really an exercise in futility because information is not being given to us.

The Alberta Opportunity Company gives us the names and size of some of the loans. I would like to have the departing Deputy Premier open the books of ADC so we can find out how many of these loans are going into default. How many people, how many corporations, are getting loans larger than the statutory limit ADC can lend without going to cabinet? You know, when we start talking about precedents, Mr. Speaker, there were publications — I don't know where they came from — about several loans in the millions of dollars that were made with ADC. Now if that was supposed to be such a big secret that we as members of the Legislature couldn't receive this information, how come it was made public in the public press? What is more important, the government's press releases or this Legislature?

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I have to say that the Legislature has been reduced to practically a charade because of the government's lack of information, because of the government's disregard for laying the cards on the table so we know why these decisions are made.

The debate on Henuset, Mr. Speaker. I was appalled, because I know there must be some conservatives on that side of the government. They can't all be socialist conservatives. There must be some true conservatives over there, but I didn't see them stand up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you?

DR. BUCK: And where are they? The hon. member from Edmonton had his opportunity. Our position was placed. We didn't hear a government position. We heard nothing but silence. The minister responsible, the hon. Mr. Getty, is a man with a lot of backbone, and a man of a lot of opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: But we didn't hear his opinion, and that honorable gentleman, the Minister of the Crown, is the man directly responsible in matters of energy. Did we hear from him, Mr. Speaker? No. I would like to beg the Premier to take the muzzles and the puppet strings off, so the hon. members of this Legislature can do their jobs on behalf of their constituents and the people of this province. I say, Mr. Chairman, they

are not doing that. And getting back to the resolution, ex-deputy speaker . . .

MR. DIACHUK: I agree, let's get back to the resolution. We might resolve it.

DR. BUCK: I would like to say that there is so much information not being given to this House, it is appalling. We endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to have — maybe we are going to get the third-in-line deputy premier up on this resolution — we are trying to have the information brought in, when the governments bills are brought in, with the background material so it can be tabled before the people, so that not only we, but they, can make some decisions. That was basically the reason we called for a committee of the House to review the tendering procedures that were used.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me during the debate that my colleagues the Hon. Mr. Hyndman and the Hon. Mr. Yurko and I have been on both sides of the House, and perhaps it would be interesting to listen to the position placed by the present opposition to see how it related to the experiences we had had in the House in the past. I thought — even though I had a meeting I'm attempting to make at 4 o'clock — surely if the opposition, after being in their constituencies for some months now, were going to designate a motion, it must be one they felt was very important. Inasmuch as they were really presenting, Mr. Speaker, a proposal to change the way the parliamentary system has worked and evolved over many years, surely they would have some pretty good reasons why they should do it. So I thought: first, it's a designated motion, it must be the most important thing they have found to talk about since they've been out of the House since fall, I should stay and hear it; secondly, if they are going to actually change parliamentary procedure as we have known it for some time in this House, I should stay and hear it too. Frankly, I have never been more disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider the role of the opposition in the House, I can't imagine that any good opposition would accept either of the things they are asking for in (2) and (3) in this resolution. Now what opposition, which is supposed to come up with its own ideas, present alternatives, would consider that what the government handed it would be what it needed to debate a bill adequately?

I can't believe, knowing the abilities of the hon. members, that they have seriously thought about this resolution. I've sat on the other side of the House, and I would no more take what the government handed out as the reasons for a bill or how it should be debated, or to make copies of it and send it all over the province as the manner of explaining legislation, or sit in the House. Because any member of the opposition has a responsibility not to take what is handed to him.

He talks about a snow job. I can't think of a better way to have a bigger snow job than to give them a whole bunch of documents, because why should they take those documents as being all the facts? It seems to me they have to research those documents and look for as many others as they could possibly find. It surely wouldn't be as bad an opposition as they sound . . .

DR. BUCK: You wouldn't listen anyway.

MR. GETTY: . . . to merely take that information.

I can remember sitting on the other side of the House and saying to myself, well the government's giving us why they feel a bill should come in. They're giving us what they think the bill will do in the province. Now if I was a lazy opposition, I think that's fine, we'd take it. But surely if you're doing the role you are elected to do and if in fact you end up in the opposition you would not follow that course of action. I'm really surprised and disappointed that the hon. members would sit and ask, as they have, for this kind of spoon-feeding. It flies in the face of the legislative and parliamentary procedure we have known in this House.

The hon. member also made some other comments. He mentioned that when he was in a caucus, he found it was unworkable because there were 55 of them. Well, Mr. Speaker, it really isn't the size, it's the leadership and the diligence of the members of a caucus that makes it successful.

DR. BUCK: Time.

MR. GETTY: If it was the size and 55 was unworkable, I would imagine they have the most efficient caucus right now anyone's ever had around here. Surely they've learned that four must be able to do a really great job.

Mr. Speaker, having had an opportunity to sit on both sides of the House, I'd like to urge the hon. members not to be taken in by the superficial arguments we've had placed today; to do some real thinking about the role of an opposition; to consider this [motion], particularly nos. 2 and 3, as something that even good members of the House have perhaps been handed by the research staff. They haven't really thought about it. They made a quick decision to put it before us. Having heard some of the arguments, they'll surely hope it does not go forward, perhaps even stand and vote against it themselves. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to defeat this superficial and unnecessary motion.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take a few moments to enter into this debate. First of all, may I say how disappointed I am that I missed the visit of the Member for Clover Bar to my constituency last weekend. As he indicated in the House today, he obviously was there because he told us what the people in my constituency were saying. Somehow or other I missed the opportunity of with meeting him. I hope when he comes back to Medicine Hat-Redcliff, he will call on me. I didn't hear any reports of his presence there.

By the way, the people of Medicine Hat-Redcliff are not talking about higher taxes introduced by the government of Alberta. There has been no indication of that, to my recollection, since we came into this House. As a matter of fact, for his edification we have the lowest taxes of any province in Canada. Let's try to keep it that way.

However, since he strayed from his motion considerably and I haven't even mentioned the motion in my remarks yet, perhaps I'd better do that now.

I think the first part of the motion is perhaps quite reasonable in that it's useful. As indicated by the

mover of the motion, the Attorney General did just that today when he handed a copy of his remarks to the acting Leader of the Opposition. However, the other two parts of the motion are completely unacceptable in this House and I think in any parliament, where on the floor we debate matters in three reading stages and committee study. We go through the whole procedure, and of course we can obtain material and information. The government can hand the members of the opposition all kinds of documents, studies, reports, and all those types of things. As the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has said, if that's what you want and that's all you want, perhaps you're approaching the role of opposition in the wrong way.

The hon. members will realize of course that in calling for "all studies, reports, and other documents upon which the principle and detail of the bill are justified", they are asking for a mountain of paperwork. Just take as an example the legislative committee on trucking regulations, which has been meeting now for several months. I've been a member of that committee with the hon. Member for Clover Bar. He is aware, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that in preparation of that report, the committee has received volumes from people making representations to that committee, a considerable number of volumes. I'm sure the files in the member's cabinet are full — that's right, full on that one subject alone — of representations made just to that committee.

Of course that is in the process of being condensed into a report which will come to this Legislature. No doubt that report will be debated here. Then of course it will be submitted to the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation will be seeking information and advice from other segments of society, and no doubt they've got all kinds of representations at the present time. They of course would represent other documents which concern principles and details of any bill which may be introduced. In regard to that one issue alone, Mr. Speaker, no doubt there are volumes which might even fill this House if we stacked them all up.

It's just absurd to think that we should take copies of studies, reports, and all other documents and file them in this House. They are just too extensive and too voluminous to bring in here. Of course if that were to apply to each bill introduced into this Legislature, there is no way that an opposition twice the size of the opposition we have in the House today could possibly begin to assimilate all that material. It's just patently absurd.

I really didn't want to say too much about item (2). It wasn't until I heard the explanation advanced by the speakers in favor of this resolution that I decided to comment at all. But in reading it closely, to realize we would have to have 75 copies of all studies, reports, and other documents would be manifestly absurd.

I did want to comment particularly in regard to clause (3) which indicates:

There shall be attached to each government bill an explanatory memorandum which shall set out the purpose of the bill, its practical effect, and the impact on previous legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been of the opinion that the use of plain and understandable language in

preparation of legislation should be an aim of all legislatures. I have said so in this House in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: The ground nuts.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, the ground nuts, thank you. I just happen to have that here. In case you've all forgotten this, I'll repeat it for the edification of members so we can avoid this type of thing. We want to avoid this type of legislation coming before this House. It occurred in the United Kingdom, and I quote:

In the Nuts (unground), (other than ground nuts) Order, the expression nuts shall have reference to such nuts, other than ground nuts, as would but for the amending Order not qualify as nuts (unground) (other than ground nuts) by reason of their being nuts (unground).

AN HON. MEMBER: How appropriate.

MR. HORSMAN: I didn't realize, Mr. Speaker, just how appropriate that quotation was in discussing this resolution.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is useful to follow the practice of this Legislature in attaching an explanatory note in regard to each section in bills, and in particular with regard to bills which amend present legislation. But difficulties are encountered in doing that, in going beyond what is current practice. First of all, the extent of the memorandum may be such, as contemplated in this motion, which would create problems in preparation, because the motion says "the purpose of the bill, its practical effect".

Now just consider for a moment those three words: "its practical effect". You may have to write volumes of explanation as to the practical effect any piece of legislation is likely to have.

For example in taxation legislation, let us assume that in discussing the budget we are going to introduce a tax reduction into the Legislature. What will the practical effect be? Carried to its absurd extremes, of course, it would require the preparation of a memorandum which would indicate exactly how much taxation would be reduced for each and every taxpayer in Alberta. Is that as far as the members are proposing? Surely not. Yet it could be interpreted that way by irrational people. And I don't consider myself irrational when I make that comment.

The "impact on previous legislation": of course, the interpretation of that could and often does fill volumes of law reports which set out interpretation by the courts of existing legislation, previous legislation, and the effect new legislation has upon previous legislation. That is one of the difficulties with an explanatory memorandum, and one of the difficulties the courts have recognized in interpreting legislation. It is just not practicably possible to do easily.

As a matter of fact, there is a rule that debates in the Legislature cannot be referred to in courts for the purpose of proving the intention of the legislation. That is only right and fair, because in the course of debate things are said in legislatures which go either way depending on whether one supports or opposes the legislation. So the practicality of this third part is just not there. You cannot do it without setting out the reasons in detail. And if there's any suggestion in this resolution that there would be legal weight

attached to such an explanatory memorandum, it becomes even more absurd.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, the place to debate the principles and details of bills is in second reading, committee stage, and if necessary third reading, in this Legislature, and not by having an interpretation placed upon the bill by way of memorandum or otherwise.

I regret that my learned colleague in this Legislature, the Member for Clover Bar, is no longer present, because I thought it would be useful for us to review some of his remarks with regard to open government. But he is not. I assume he has gone off to do some constituency business, which of course is the only reason one should be absent from the House, according to what he said to us this afternoon.

But for the record, since we have a *Hansard*, I think it is useful to point out that *Hansard* was introduced by this government and the administration under our current Premier. And I would be interested indeed to learn where the hon. member went back in the records, as he said, to find the speeches of the then leader of the opposition and now Premier of this province, because as I recall there was no *Hansard* at that time. I think there were some tape recordings made, but only after urgings by the then opposition. So, Mr. Speaker, open government was really introduced as far as this Legislature was concerned by the government of Premier Peter Lougheed.

As far as the growing bureaucracy is concerned, I should like to know one member of the opposition who has not stood in this Legislature since I have been here in the last two years and called for more and more government action. They want us to do more and more and more for the people of Alberta, but they want it done with fewer and fewer people. If anything has ever illustrated the absurdity of their allegations with regard to the bureaucracy, it is the fact that they call for more and more government.

I'm going to take it upon myself during this term of the Legislature to keep a little record of the times they rise in this Assembly and ask for a few little things to be done. But they don't want anybody to implement the policies. I hope that perhaps by the end of this session I'll have quite a little list available — I know I will, if their past record is any indication — to read for the members of the opposition of all those things they have asked this government to do for the people of Alberta that we're not presently doing.

MR. McCRAE: I was going to suggest, Mr. Member, that you might send them a copy of it to save them keeping track of records themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: In advance.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I really want to conclude my remarks. Once again, regretfully the Member for Clover Bar is not here. I had some remarks I particularly wanted to address to him and to his remarks to us earlier this afternoon. But as I say, he can perhaps read it in *Hansard*, and I'll save my remarks for some future occasion when I have an opportunity to remind him of some of his comments today.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether or not I should take up more time on the resolution. If it

were a bread-and-butter resolution that would have some impact on the people or the economy of this province, then I could see us taking all the time we've taken today. But it's really a resolution that deals with the convenience of members. I think we're getting to the point where we're spending too much time thinking about the convenience of the MLAs instead of the tasks we were sent here to do, to look after the interests of the people.

[Not recorded] however, really the only reason I'm standing up to speak on this resolution is that I object to resolutions that contain more than one major item. This resolution contains at least three. In my view such resolutions should be declared not in order, because a member is put in a position where he's supporting some of the items and not supporting the others. According to *Beauchesne* a motion like that is not in order, because you're putting a member in a ridiculous position. If you vote for it, you're voting for something in which you don't believe. If you vote against it, you're voting against something in which you do believe. And that was never the intention of resolutions.

So really the motion has been badly drawn up, with all respect to the hon. member. I doubt if the hon. member drew it up, because I think he would know that principle very well. But whoever drew it up certainly should have had in mind that they're asking members to vote on three different items.

For instance, the first item is ministerial statements. Frankly, I don't agree with the way it's written. I think copies of ministerial statements are important. But why should only the Leader of the Opposition have them? Other members in this party were elected with larger majorities than he was, if you want to go by that. And in my view the fact that there are four sitting in one group doesn't give them any special significance. If we're going to give out these ministerial statements, why doesn't every member of the House have a chance to have a copy, if we want to start properly giving out the information? I haven't found it difficult to get copies following a ministerial statement. They're generally covered quite aptly by the press. Or those who want it can get it and make a copy themselves within a few minutes, and consequently you'd probably save a lot of paper.

I object to the inference that the Leader of the Opposition should have two copies, and no concern about whether other members have a copy at all. If he gets two copies I can see about as much chance of me getting a copy as a snowball in Hades has of staying a snowball. It would probably go to the other Socreds or possibly to the NDP member. I don't see how that's spreading information. That's just spreading confusion, if that's what you want to do. So we're talking there about ministerial statements. That's one thing. Some have said they could support it, and some have said they couldn't support it.

Now when we come to the second thing, it deals with another topic entirely: the explanatory note on government bills. Again, why are government bills pointed out? The present government, and every government in Canada, permits private members' bills, whether they're on the government or the opposition side of the House. There is a difference now from the time when the Socreds were in power. The government of that day ordained that no bill introduced by an opposition member could be debated.

They were just never called. They got first reading, and that's all there was to it. Now we at least have the opportunity of presenting our arguments in second reading. One bill of mine, at least, got to Committee of the Whole at the last session. Had there been more time, it probably would have gone further. But the principle was discussed in second reading, and that was the point we wanted to make.

I can see no reason why a bill, if it contains good material, if it's satisfactory to the people of the province, if it can carry the judgment of a majority of the members of the Legislature, should not become law, irrespective of whether it is introduced by a backbencher or somebody on the government side of the House. So why are we saying that only government bills have to have an explanatory note? Why don't we say, bills introduced in the Legislature? I don't like that discrimination. If one bill is going to require an explanatory note, let's have all of them with an explanatory note.

Then of course we come to the ridiculous part: "a copy of all studies [and] reports". I introduced bills when I was Minister of Highways and minister of youth in this province, and it would have taken a truck to bring all the material if I was going to file it, to deal with the amendments to The Highway Traffic Act alone. When you're talking about axle loadings and speed limits and driver licensing, the volume of material we go through before we come up with that is just tremendous, as the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff said.

I wouldn't have been surprised if the hon. member from Fort Saskatchewan had introduced the bill, because he's never been in the position where he's had to present bills to the Legislature or take the responsibility for them. But the hon. member who moved the bill has. I dare say some of the bills he introduced would also take at least a wheelbarrow to bring in the material.

Now what are we going to do with it after it's there? I have difficulty reading all the material we get right now. I'm wondering if the Socred members are reading all the material we're getting right now. I don't see them taking much part in the discussions on the bills. Many, many bills go through without one of them saying a word. So I'm wondering if they're reading the material we get now, let alone getting more material.

But that isn't the point of the section. The section is asking for something ridiculous, and something no government could possibly do. You just couldn't do it if you wanted to, because to reprint the books on highway traffic alone, what's involved in the highway traffic legislation, would be an impossible task. You wouldn't even have a place in the library to put it if it was done.

So there's a second thing entirely different from the first. You might support one, you might support both, you might not support either. But in either case you are dealing with two different principles, two different points. One is supplying a copy of a ministerial statement, which can be done without too much expense or too much difficulty. But the supplying of all the bases for the laws of the province is asking you to provide a law library every time you do it, and all the books involved in the present library.

Then we come to the third point, where we ask for the explanatory memorandum. At one time in this

House a bill was introduced without the minister or the member saying a word about the bill; no need to give any explanation at all. It was during the '50s when the Liberal member, Hugh John MacDonald, who is now a judge, and the late Senator Harper Prowse raised the point very vehemently that they should be told what the bill is when it's being introduced. That started the rhetoric, at least in the previous government, and that has been followed. And it's a good practice for the minister to say briefly what the bill is going to do.

I also like the idea of putting on the explanatory note about the major thing that bill is going to do. That is done in some bills today, and in some bills it is not done. I think it helps a great deal when there's a short explanatory note giving the main purpose of that bill. I realize that in some bills dealing with umpteen dozen things, a large bill like The Highway Traffic Act, it's going to be impossible to give one simple explanation. But in a lot of the bills, the explanatory note is important. However, I think that can be handled, and I think it should be done. I support that part of this motion. I think we can spend more time giving a short, explicit, pungent explanation of the bill. It would help everyone to decide whether or not they're going to pursue a detailed study of that bill or otherwise.

But when it comes to set out the purpose of the bill, its practical effect, and its impact, I don't know what the hon. member means by that. It would take a book to explain all the practical effects of many sections of The Highway Traffic Act. As a matter of fact, the practical effect of a simple thing like increasing the speed limit of a vehicle is to move traffic faster on a particular highway. Another practical effect is that it's going to use more fuel. Another practical effect is that it may encourage a driver to drive faster than his ability to drive. Another practical effect is the effect it has on the tires. Another practical effect is the stresses and strains it creates on the roadbed. Another practical effect is: how deep do you build the subgrade of a road if you're going to increase the speed limit? Is the hon. member suggesting that books or volumes on each of these items, all of which have had volumes written about them, would have to be attached to the bill? Talk about pages. They're all going to have to get a wheelbarrow to move the bills from the member to the Clerk of the House.

I think we are sent here as members to ascertain the practical effect and the impact of any bill and any law that we pass. To ascertain that practical effect, I have a practice of sending it to constituents to see what effect it's going to have on them, of deciding myself whether or not this is going to have a good or bad effect on the people who sent me here to be their spokesman. So I don't want anybody telling me what the practical effect is. I want to ascertain that myself and vote accordingly.

The same with the impact on previous legislation. If you delete a section, I suppose the impact is to do away with the previous section. How do you explain that? You've simply done away with it, and you're putting something in its place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution has been ill-advised. It contains more than one principle. It's asking members to support three different, separate items, which is contrary to good legislation and in my view contrary to a resolution. I question whether we

should even be debating it, because it is dealing with three different things and we have to vote for three things in one vote, which I think almost means the resolution is going to be defeated even before it is presented.

The resolution itself is not that important. It's dealing with the convenience of members. About the only thing you could say is that the first one is making information a little more readily available than it is now. But there is certainly no difficulty in getting copies of any ministerial statement now. Consequently, I can't support the resolution.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I can't resist . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead Dave.

MR. KING: If there was less of that, I would be down even quicker. I can't resist the opportunity to make just a few brief comments about this, Mr. Speaker.

I think a number of us wondered why, when the House has not been in session for some four and a half months, on the first opportunity this should be the subject of the designated motion from the opposition. If no one else said it earlier in the House during my absence, I would like to comment that it obviously speaks well for the governance of the province, while the House was prorogued, that this is the most serious subject that can come to the attention of the opposition while they are thinking about their activity during the period from November to February of this year.

I'd just like to say, briefly, that in the British House of Commons they don't have any desks at all. All they have are benches for the members to sit on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hard benches.

MR. KING: Yes, hard benches. There aren't enough benches for all of the members of the British House of Commons. It is a reflection of some peculiar belief they have, that members should think on their feet and not on their seats and that you should only be in the House when you are there to make a contribution. I think the resolution offered by the hon. members opposite reflects their ignorance of the benches in the British House of Commons and the reason there are benches rather than desks.

I think too that it may possibly reflect some alienation of affection between the hon. members opposite and the media. I have some familiarity with the relationship between the opposition, irrespective of party and the media. In my experience the media, who believe they also have a contribution to make toward good government, do something which is known as feeding the opposition. That is to say, they suggest questions that should be asked and provide copies of information or any other kind of material they think may contribute to the opposition doing a good job in the Legislature and consequently, of course, to the government doing a good job of governing. It may be that we are being asked now to provide for the opposition those things which the media are no longer providing, having given up in disgust on the kind of

job the opposition is doing.

I think it also suggests a very serious misunderstanding of the role of the opposition. I don't think anyone in this House or any other has ever suggested or indeed even thought for a moment that it is the responsibility of the opposition to be intimately familiar with the technical detail of every piece of legislation that comes before this or every other House. That in my view is not their responsibility.

Their responsibility is to feel comfortable with principles, to feel comfortable with certain perspectives towards problems, and to feel comfortable with expressing certain attitudes. Their responsibility is precisely the opposite of the responsibility of the government.

If it is the responsibility of the government to know and to be able to count all the trees in the forest, and if that is the function of the 30,000 civil servants, then conversely it is the responsibility of the opposition to dissociate itself from the trees, to be able to step back and to be able to say on some dispassionate grounds that they can comment on the state of the forest as a whole.

I seriously believe that the hon. members opposite are doing themselves and the role of the opposition a disservice when they stand in this Legislature and beg to be inundated with the kind of material with which we can certainly provide them, and we have on many occasions.

I can recall that when the hon. minister now responsible for housing was the Minister of the Environment, pages trundled in reams and reams, volumes and volumes of information, none of which the hon. members opposite ever managed to get through. That is, not in totality, even though I understand a couple of them took speed reading courses.

AN HON. MEMBER: They need to.

AN HON. MEMBER: They didn't graduate.

MR. KING: Basic education first.

AN HON. MEMBER: It hasn't helped.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, what is recommended in part (1) is presently being done, and has been done in this House for some time. The only thing that part (1) of the resolution would impose upon the activity of this House is some impediment to spontaneity.

I think there is no better illustration than the ministerial statement made in this House yesterday by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. The form of that statement had not been set out beforehand. He stood in the House and he excerpted paragraphs from a certain document, one here and another there. Subsequent to reading excerpts, he made a few spontaneous remarks. The effect of the resolution proposed by the hon. member opposite would be to prohibit that kind of ministerial statement in this House. And to the extent that we are going to inhibit spontaneity, I think the whole activity of the House is going to suffer.

With respect to part (2) of the resolution, there has been no suggestion by any of the hon. members opposite that this would provide them with access to information to which they do not presently have access. There is no suggestion that this would be the

method by which we would present to them material not presently available to them. The only suggestion is that the government, or someone on the government's behalf, should organize it conveniently so they don't have to look for it in the library or ask their research assistants to look for it there.

As has been said by the hon. Member for Drumheller, if the only import of the resolution is that we should spend money and time to organize in a more convenient form things already available to the opposition in order that they can more conveniently give up their important responsibility in the Legislature, in order to attempt to take on some of the responsibilities of the government, then I think that is not good sense for them or for us.

No one, I think, could speak better to part (3) of the resolution than the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, with whose remarks I fully concur. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no good reason for voting for any part of this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, first of all I'd like to comment on the importance of the resolution. A number of members have commented with regard to that and the timing. Certainly we recognize that the resolution was for the benefit of the members of the Legislative Assembly and, we may say, not for the benefit of the public. But I can answer both of those particular questions.

First of all, the timing. We felt that in order to implement any changes in procedure in this Legislature, this was the time we had to do it. This was our first opportunity. So we introduced it as our first designated motion and felt it was important enough to debate. We certainly have many other concerns that we can raise about constituency matters, about things happening across this province, about utility rates, power rates, gas and co-ops, agricultural problems, and many other things. But we felt in order to have this kind of policy or procedure incorporated into the bills that will be presented to us in the next two or three weeks . . . Those will be the bills we discuss this session and in the fall, because normally any that are introduced now, such as the planning act, are carried over into the fall session. It doesn't give the opportunity for government to rewrite or add to it. We felt that because of that the timing was most important, and if we were to make the change in procedure, now was the time to do it, and we indicated that.

The importance to the public: we feel it is very important that the general public have as much information as possible about various bills. The hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources said he would not accept that particular opinion because it's [inaudible] the government. Well maybe we wouldn't accept it either. If we sent the bill to one of our constituents or to someone in the province, we would most likely attach a memorandum saying: the government's position is enclosed in the bill, but in this memo is our position; we would like you to assess it, give your reaction and input. We'd have the citizens of Alberta involved in the legislative process. That's

what we want to do, Mr. Speaker.

I can't see for the life of me, number one, how anybody can say that we're only concerned about ourselves and, number two, that accepting a government opinion is a bad thing to do, because if I were the government I'd certainly want my opinion to spread across the province and people to know what I'm doing and what my attitudes are. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is just no credibility in those two arguments that were used.

The question was also raised with regard to the reason the Leader of the Opposition is the person to receive two copies of the announcement that is to be made. If we check in *Beauchesne* under Section 91(1), it is indicated that after a ministerial announcement the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to have an explanation or make a few remarks. It also indicates there is no debate on the statement at that point in time. But that is the person who is designated or allowed under the traditional parliamentary rules.

MR. TAYLOR: Why does he need two copies?

MR. R. SPEAKER: The other comment is about the amount of material. We have indicated, and I indicated in the opening debate, that the material could be placed in the Legislature Library at the discretion, awareness, and objectivity of the minister. At the present time, all that material is housed somewhere in the government. If they feel it's too much, maybe when the bill is presented in the House some type of list of the background material could be placed in a place where we could find it, in the government departments or in the Legislature Library. Maybe that's a change we should have made.

But nobody looked at it constructively on that basis. It was: we're going to bring in wheelbarrows of material, reports that are no good, and we're going to have volumes of stuff down in the library of this Legislature Building. If someone had looked at it and was ready to accept something that was reasonable — and I felt this resolution was reasonable — that could have been an amendment introduced into this Legislative Assembly, and we'd have accepted that particular point of view. Even a list is better than the lack of information we have at the present time.

What about the explanations? There were also comments made with regard to the explanatory memorandum. We felt, and I certainly feel, that the explanatory memorandum — the purpose, the effects — could have been placed on the back two or three pages of the bill. It certainly doesn't have any legal implications at all, but the information could have been placed at that point in the bill and would have been made available to us. Certainly we didn't expect a long documented effort, but some good concrete information.

I've examined the Speech from the Throne with regard to the bills, and there are 24 different bills listed. Possibly four of those are the only bills of any consequence that would have required long explanations. In the other 20, most likely a short paragraph would have taken care of the explanation. So anyone indicating that there is a lot of work to that type of thing certainly is not on base at the present time and has not examined the response of the legislation or the bills that are before us. It is not a lot of work.

And it would only be a few bills, such as the planning act. That would take a lot of explanation. The majority — like I say, 20 out of 24 — would have required very little information.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have made a reasonable request at this time. It was the time when we had to do it. I'd certainly urge the members of this Assembly to support the resolution.

[Motion lost]

2. Moved by Mr. Diachuk:

Be it resolved that the provincial government give consideration to introduction of legislation amending The School Act to provide for the distribution of corporate assessments on a per pupil basis for those corporations that are unable to determine the religious faith of their shareholders.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, at this time of the day after this heavy generated debate I want to get into something that is of a more quiet nature, something that isn't too controversial, something that possibly many members will participate in and I'm confident doesn't require too much research or material but [only] the facts that we have with us from experience. In the resolution I have here it is nice to know that after a few days even the correction in the spelling has improved. In the earlier part of the week "introduction" was spelled with two d's, and now it's spelled with one, the correct way. So if we give everything time, it seems to work itself out.

In a sense what I'm talking about is really taxes. When I refer to *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, tax is a charge of money imposed by authority upon persons or property for public purposes. Some of us have different backgrounds. Some of us have different experiences. This is what I'm hoping will be generated in this Assembly from our backgrounds, our experiences — what we should do with a situation now in Alberta that requires a remedy.

I myself attended a public school, first in a four-by-four system [in] which the direct taxation of the ratepayers of that school district funded the total cost of the financial obligation of the school district. I then proceeded to a centralized school funded by a school division. Even though I had that type of a background, I had the pleasant experience of serving for some nine years, seven continuous ones, as a trustee on the Edmonton Separate School Board. Three of those years I spent on the executive of the Alberta School Trustees' Association with members both Catholic and non-Catholic, with members of separate school districts that were not necessarily Catholic. Because in this province we do have fairly large Protestant separate school districts, and some that are also concerned about what the future of their funding is, of finances in the years to come.

The problem we're really encountering here is that boards must continue to protect themselves from serious loss of assessments. I would like to refer to a few instruments, a few pieces of material, I have.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

At the outset I want to refer to an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal* dated January 6, 1977. The timing seemed to be very appropriate. That was

Ukrainian Christmas Eve under the Julian calendar. The editor must have been very generous and wanted to say something constructive for the people on that occasion. He indicated:

... it is time the provincial government stepped into the picture and rebuilt its antiquated structure of education financing. The separate school system in this province stands on a foundation laid by the Alberta Act, a product of the federal Parliament in 1905. This stipulates that the system of separate schools in effect in the Northwest Territories in 1905 must continue in effect.

He did, however, point out and complimented — he said:

At the same time, the province has a clear duty to see that there is no inequity among educational opportunities available to her young people, be they registered in public or separate schools. To this end it should devise an equitable system for dividing the taxes raised by education levies.

I want to say he indicated in this same editorial that we in Alberta were actually pioneers in human rights legislation. We should look and determine what would be the best way, because we have some precedents. We brought some legislation into this Assembly: protect individual rights, protect human rights. Therefore his comments were that we have an obligation. It is very current.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter from the chairman of the Edmonton Catholic school district, Mr. Gibeau, he indicates it is impossible to apply some of the sections of the present act. He refers to Section 60. It was interesting that possibly it is time we looked at some of these sections that we now have in the act. He does mention that at present the Edmonton separate school system educates some 30 per cent of the children of the city and presently receives 25.2 per cent of the assessment. With some of the recent occurrences, they're going to lose even more of the assessment. Now I'm given to understand that as recently as this week there are precedents in other parts of the province, in Calgary, in Medicine Hat, in McMurray, and I wouldn't be surprised if this is taking place even in places where — and I don't have any information on it — where are Protestant separate school districts.

I want to also refer to an article from the *St. John's Edmonton Report* — a fairly complimentary magazine that does a fairly good job — that also makes reference that the legislation is somewhat antiquated. I have to admit that I didn't think it was antiquated, because I was on the trustees' association back in 1969 when the former government was completely reviewing The School Act. But I guess all of us who were involved and in the process of changes, we who were in the school boards, we who were in the Legislature — and there are some members sitting here in the opposition who were members of the government at that time — brought in some legislation that critics feel within seven years is antiquated. I think they're only being kind and polite to us. We have to take a look at the need for change. Before we look into what some trustees are asking, when a number of us members of the Legislature met with Zone 2 of the Alberta School Trustees Association, under the heading of *Funding and Public Perceptions* "School boards are recommending the development of new sources of funding for education

in Alberta."

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can resolve the dilemma we have before us with the present funding before we move in. Because it just isn't proper to move into a new phase of funding before we have the present funding resolved. We can all say well, it is a constitutional matter. I have looked into it to a certain extent, not being legally trained and being able to understand the jargon in all this legislation, but it's just as one of my colleagues said today when he read Section 60 and couldn't understand just what it meant. That is what we're up against. I believe that the legislation we have in this province doesn't restrict the approach to the funding of education.

A news release from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, dated January 20, gives another perspective. It indicates as a proposal for property tax growth sharing:

... a Province-wide sharing among municipalities of a portion of the growth in commercial and industrial assessment. Growth would be measured from a pre-determined base year calculation, and a percentage of the assessment over and above that base calculation, whether from a new or expanded facility, would go to make up the growth pool.

I'm all for this, and I think it's good and commendable. But again, we have this other dilemma that there are people in this province battling over what assessment they're entitled to. The resolution is broad enough and restrictive enough: broad enough that it could even provide a distribution of assessment to the people supporting private, independent schools; restrictive enough that it still may, if we want to, provide the legislation only, bring in legislation in cases where the corporation is unable to determine the religious faith of the shareholders.

We at present — without any real statistics here, but I'm advised — are funding some 70 per cent of the educational funding in this province on a per pupil basis. This came about some years ago. The beginning was when the foundation program was brought in by the former government, as an approach to provide a more equal and equitable funding for education throughout the province. I am advised that at that time the two boards in the city of Calgary were not involved at all in trying to distribute assessment. As a matter of fact, city hall in Calgary prior to that time asked the two systems, what is the population of your pupils, and on that ratio distributed the assessment.

However, when the foundation program was brought in it required the distribution of the assessment, because that was what it was based on. Then naturally the municipal government, the city of Calgary, had to have people in city hall; the school boards had to hire people to drum up and make sure they got their rightful assessment. In the city of Edmonton that has continued back many years prior to that time.

Educational dollars have been spent on something that I maintain should never be spent to distribute assessment, to disperse the assessment even on residential property. Maybe we could even move further, Mr. Speaker, and do away with all distribution of assessment, particularly when there is so much funding now being done through all our educational programs through the provincial government. If it isn't,

we are still being blamed whenever there is a shortage. Even today I received a letter from a school in my constituency, wanting to meet with the Premier, the Minister of Education, me, and the chairman of the board. They are blaming us, the provincial government, for lack of funds in their schools. They don't say, well we don't know who to blame — they are going right to the bulk of the source of present funding.

I think we could be leaders in this. I feel the climate is right. I believe we have enough people in this province who will appreciate this. We may have some advocates [who say] this is wrong, I don't want any portion of my assessment to go to support that other school system.

I know there are examples, Mr. Speaker. I know the example of the case now being contested in Calgary because the family maintained they don't want their children to go to the separate school system, and don't want their assessment to go to the separate school system. They maintain they are practising Catholics and are not about to declare they don't practise their belief. Yet they want their children to go to the other school system. It is now in the courts.

At the same time I personally know of examples in this city, where people of the Protestant faith have their children attending the separate school system. They attend their Protestant church, the church of their choice. They don't hesitate to mark on the assessment roll that they are supporters of the Catholic faith, because nowadays to fill out a card for city hall, many people don't take it too seriously and do it. And vice versa.

I personally know people who fall under the separate school enrolment [who] just choose to say, we are public school supporters. Their assessment goes to the public school and their children go to public school.

Then there are others where the two school systems have a gentlemen's agreement and work it out, for a need, for some special programs. They go ahead and just say, that's fine, you send so-and-so over to this special program in our school and we will do the same when we need some of your special educational services. They do that. Some might be on the basis that the child can't travel as far where that school district has its program. Some might be on the basis of this special program being close to home, and why should they travel across the city and require additional expenditure in transportation. We have examples where it's working out.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should be reluctant to propose to the government bringing about changes in the legislation to in some way possibly even do away with all this expenditure of distributing the assessment. I would 'guesstimate' that in this province we are spending possibly hundreds of thousands of dollars just to distribute the assessment, dollars that are really designated and should go to education. Now that's fine. Possibly we have a number of people employed, and it aids to the employment of people when we have assessment officers doing this, assessment officers doing that, and procedures. And this is fine. But I don't think this is what it's intended to do, and I don't think removing those people from that type of employment in jurisdictions where they have them will be that big a hardship. In smaller

jurisdictions the secretary treasurer or the chairman of the board is doing it. But he or she still has to take the time to do it to convince that municipal jurisdiction to get their rightful share of their assessment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased I'm able to introduce this resolution today. I understand that according to our rules this resolution will come up on Tuesday. It will give many members who have indicated they weren't sure what I really wanted to propose in this resolution an opportunity to read *Hansard* and to discuss this further with me, because I believe the hon. minister Mr. Koziak is looking for direction. I know he is being bombarded with letters. I would only urge that members of this Assembly look at the question of resolving once and for all the separation of assessments, the distribution of assessments. Let's resolve it and say we've done it well in Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the motion on the Order Paper today by the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, in the next few minutes I'd like to give my understanding of the history of what has occurred. As I understand the situation in Alberta, for a number of years we have had an understanding or gentleman's agreement between the respective school boards in terms of identifying what business assessment should properly go to the public school system and the separate school system. In general, Mr. Speaker, while there have been discussions, there were no aggravations which would lead to a disagreement of major sorts until a few years back. As a consequence of challenges, which I think began in a small way and then involved the legal fraternity and the courts, we now have a judgment which seems to have posed a problem which is of fairly immediate and I think severe proportions, especially for the Roman Catholic separate school districts.

Mr. Speaker, in his motion the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly has proposed a form of resolution for that problem. Since I won't be able to complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to perhaps outline the proposed formula to its conclusion according to the logic I apply to it. According to my understanding of his proposition, it is that distribution of corporate assessment should be on a per-pupil basis for those corporations unable to determine the religious faith of their shareholders. That means that in corporate assessment we would have three groups of corporations: those which could identify themselves as public school supporters, those which could identify themselves as Roman Catholic school supporters and could not be so challenged, and those which could not identify themselves, or if so were challenged in that identification.

If we follow the formula, with this third category we would then be in a position where we would say that — if it were to turn out that way — two-thirds of the students go to the public school system, one-third to the separate school system; so that one-third of the assessment of this C group, the unknown religious affiliation, should go to the separate school district. Now the question is: if we start to look at the assessment — and the end result of our quest, of course, is tax funds — how do we identify which individual corporations should go where? Because if we're not able to identify individual corporations, we are then forced to come up with a mill rate for

another body to collect and apportion to the school districts.

Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, the separate school districts and the public school districts have had a variation in their mill rates; not very much, but some. If we are to maintain the capability for a variation in mill rate — in other words, if we are to maintain a capability for the school districts to have taxing authority — I think the proposal before us would lead us into very grave difficulties, because we are unable to say that X corporation should pay the mill rate of the separate school district and Y corporation the mill rate of the public school district. If we say they are to pay a composite rate, potentially we're going to have three mill rates in the corporate sector within one municipal area: the mill rate the public school district has, the mill rate of the separate school district, and the average mill rate for the unidentified group from a religious or a school support basis.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go this far with my remarks today because I wanted to indicate that it's a very complex problem. It's a problem that carries with it the challenge of being fair to the respective school jurisdictions, and at the same time the challenge of enabling those school jurisdictions to continue to tax independently of one another and to have some flexibility in establishing their own mill rates on

the tax base they have.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I'd like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: I move we call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Assuming agreement of the Assembly, the Assembly stands adjourned . . . I'm sorry, I've anticipated the next step.

MR. HYNDMAN: I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m., Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House adjourned at 5:28 p.m.]

