

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, November 26, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **READING AND
RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the petition I presented yesterday, November 25, from in excess of 18,000 citizens from the Lethbridge and southern Alberta areas regarding St. Michael's hospital be now read.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Speaker, I certify that this petition is in order to be read:

To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in Legislature assembled:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Alberta humbly shows:

That they earnestly request the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Alberta to permit and support the continued operation of St. Michael's hospital in Lethbridge as a fully active treatment facility with no reduction in present bed capacity, services, nor medical specialists on staff.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Private Bills, I hereby report the Standing Committee on Private Bills has had under consideration the undermentioned private Bill, and begs to report the same with the recommendation that it be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 98

The Personal Property Security Act

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill 98, The Personal Property Security Act.

In making just a few remarks about it, I might indicate that it's not intended to proceed with this Bill. In the event of adjournment until spring, instead of prorogation, it would be intended that it would still die on the Order Paper after that prorogation, because some considerable amount of time for public feedback would be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill would consolidate the law of personal property, insofar as it relates to security for debts, into a single piece of legislation rather than in the form it presently is, in The Chattel Security Registries Act, The Conditional Sales Act, The Bills of Sale Act, and The Assignments of Book Debts Act. As a result of

the enactment of this, those pieces of legislation would in due course be repealed.

The proposals in the Bill, the legislative frameworks, would commend themselves to future use of highly automated and efficient systems. Therefore, if the Bill is passed in the next number of months, the forecast for implementation of the new systems would still be perhaps a couple of years down the road. I mention that because that begins to describe the complexity of what is proposed to be undertaken.

The bringing together of the legislation into one makes the registry system more efficient, although larger, and far more useful to people who are engaged in transactions involving personal property. It would involve personal property of any size, in the sense that it would impact on both consumer-type purchases and the type of purchase of movable property that involves very substantial heavy equipment and the like, as well as motor vehicles.

It obviously would define the rights of creditors and debtors in respect of all these transactions, and perhaps create a few new concepts in the sense of the manner in which filings are done, as compared with the way they're done at the present time when the whole document is presented. The idea under this legislation would be that it's possible to submit summaries or statements in connection with the security claimed.

It deals with the question of the rights of a purchaser buying and taking delivery of an item in what is commonly referred to as the ordinary course of business. It deals with the question of how priorities would be settled between people making claims on items of personal property in respect of which they claim security.

In the areas where special interests are created, such as where a lien for repairs exists or where new money is injected into a financing or refinancing, other than in such cases the Act would create a priority interest based primarily on the time of registration. The rights of the vendor or lessor would be curtailed, except as to the value of the goods sold or leased in the ordinary event. Among other things, the legislation would also establish the registry I referred to earlier and create an assurance fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 98 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: In case there was some concern about the length of the introduction, in fairness I think it should be said the legislation is of undoubted complexity and embodies a great number of principles.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Legislature the Farming for the Future 1980 progress report.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as the minister of Executive Council charged with responsibility for Disaster Services, I take pleasure in tabling the annual report of Alberta Disaster Services for the year ended March 31, 1980, as required by statute.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to table the annual report of the Department of Labour, as required by statute.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta health care insurance plan, ended March 31, 1980.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Assembly the following reports: Tourism Alternatives for Grande Cache, by MTB Consultants Ltd.; Grand Centre/Bonnyville Regional Tourism Development Alternatives, by Marshal Macklin Monahan Ltd.; Tourism Alternatives for Southwest Alberta, along with Appendix A, by MTB Consultants; and Assessment of the Tourism Resources of Southeastern Alberta, by the IBI Group.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the minority report with respect to the select committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 54 junior high students from St. Gabriel school, located in the Edmonton Gold Bar constituency.

In their midst are some special people: an exchange student, Alphonse Jose, from Guatemala; principal, Mr. Paul Stewart who, incidentally, was a classmate of the hon. Speaker at St. Joseph high school some years ago — I will not mention when; Mr. Mike Carby, the assistant principal; and Mr. Steve Panek, a staff member, who happens to be one of the first students I taught on coming to Alberta. Would the staff and students please rise and accept the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the House a group of Calgarians under the name of Ski Action Alberta, who are here to lobby the Calgary MLAs with regard to ski facilities. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 33 grade 6 students from Kameyosek school. About one-third of this class is in the English as a second language program. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Bouwmeester and Mrs. Reynar, and the principal of Kameyosek school, Ron Hodges, who is also a member of the Alberta Library Board.

I would like to advise the Assembly, particularly the Minister of Education, that Kameyosek, which in Cree means "the beautiful", is a community school. I would tell the minister that the concept there is working because, in addition to having a great community spirit, Kameyosek has many beautiful students. These students come from all parts of Canada and the world and are truly a beautiful addition to our community. I would ask the members of the grade 6 class and their chaperones to stand in the public gallery and receive the greetings of this Assembly.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly 20 citizens of the Lethbridge and southern Alberta area who have come north to Edmonton to see the Legislature in action. I would be less than honest if I did not say that the petition presented yesterday and read today was not

in some small way involved with their, attendance here today. They are seated in the public gallery, accompanied by the chairman of the Committee for Two Active Treatment Hospitals, Ron Scott. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that they now rise and receive the traditional welcome of this Assembly.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Department of
Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that our government has reached its decisions with respect to representations to the British select committee on foreign affairs in London and to the Canadian special joint committee on the constitution in Ottawa.

In the case of the British select committee, Alberta will make a formal written submission to the committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Anthony Kershaw. In addition, we will request that we be allowed to appear before the committee to expand upon the written representation. Whether or not the government of Alberta is allowed to appear before the committee is a matter which will be determined by that committee in response to their own rules of procedure.

In the case of the special joint committee on the constitution, which is currently holding hearings in Ottawa, Alberta will not be making a representation, nor will we request that we be allowed to appear before the committee. Alberta outlined its objections to the current process of federal constitutional review during the recent debate in this Legislature, and that resolution received resounding support by a vote of 70 to one.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Alberta and five other provinces have decided to initiate legal proceedings to ascertain the court's opinion on this questionable constitutional process by the federal government.

We have been monitoring the activities of the special joint committee, and have concluded that the outcome has been predetermined by the Ottawa government and that therefore any appearance before it is futile. We believe such an appearance in Ottawa is inconsistent with our view that it is not only Ottawa that can determine the terms of our Canadian constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached our decision with a great deal of thought and consideration by our caucus, and we will be communicating our views on the constitutional process currently under consideration to all members of the House of Commons. In addition, our views and concerns have been expressed by letter to the government of Canada.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the ministerial announcement, there are two points I'd like to make. I'd like to express the regret of my colleagues and me that the Alberta government has not seen fit to attempt to be heard before the joint Commons and Senate committee in Ottawa. Whether the government or this Legislature feels that the committee's recommendations have been predetermined or not, it seems to my colleagues and me that that would have been another opportunity for Alberta to put its case forward before the members of the Senate and House of Commons on that committee. I regret that Alberta is not taking that initiative.

The second comment I'd like to make deals with the decision to make representation to the British select committee on foreign affairs. I welcome the announcement by the government that Alberta feels it appropriate to make representation. I want to be very clear about the next comment I'm going to make. With the greatest respect to the Executive Council, I believe that Alberta's representation to that committee would be stronger if that representation was made by a committee of this Assembly, as opposed to the government, because the committee the Alberta government will be appearing before is a committee of both sides of the House in Westminster. I would ask the minister and Executive Council to give serious consideration to that view.

I want to file this caveat very clearly. I am in no way suggesting that the committee I was mentioned to last evening is the vehicle that should be used. But I want to make the point very clearly: it seems to me that when one is appearing before a select committee of the House in London, there would be an advantage to have representation from both sides of the House here rather than the government.

Department of Social Services and Community Health

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to announce the formation of the Alberta committee for the International Year of the Disabled Person. This is a follow-up to the announcement I made at the annual meeting of the Edmonton Association for the Mentally Retarded on September 23, 1980, and the remarks I made in the Legislative Assembly pertaining to the International Year of the Disabled Person on October 24, 1980.

As all hon. members are aware, the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed 1981 the International Year of the Disabled Person. Governmental and non-governmental organizations are forming committees for International Year of the Disabled Person at local, provincial, and national levels.

In Alberta the committee will be co-ordinating the disbursement of \$200,000 in provincial funds. The committee will establish criteria for project funding, receive and assess project applications, and set priorities for determining projects and channelling funds. A further \$150,000 in provincial funds will be administered to provide for co-ordination of a public awareness program and preparation of a follow-up report to activities in Alberta during 1981. These special allocations relate to activities within the year itself. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we are launching further major initiatives of a longer term nature, covering sheltered workshops, new facilities, and additional staffing.

The committee will be chaired by Judge Brian Stevenson of Calgary. Other committee members will include Richard Hiatt from Winterburn, Donna Desjardines from St. Paul, Donald Patterson from Calgary, Gary McPherson from Edmonton, Ichio Ibuki from Lethbridge, John Keates from Edmonton, Elfriede Willms from Bow Island, and Gerard Nicolet from Fahler.

Mr. Speaker, the formation of the Alberta committee, coupled with the announcement made yesterday by my colleague the Hon. Jim Horsman, Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and other initiatives that will be announced by other members of the Alberta government, are intended to strengthen the commitment of Albertans to disabled persons.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Commonwealth Membership

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It deals with a matter that is of extreme importance to not only the citizens of this province but this Assembly, because this Assembly is affiliated with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

In the course of discussions with the province of Alberta, has the government of Canada ever indicated it was considering cutting the ties with the Commonwealth if the British House of Commons does not deal with the Canada Act, 1980, in a manner the federal government deemed to be appropriate?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no indication has been given to this government in any way we've been able to ascertain that such a position has even been contemplated by the federal government. The only factor we can look at is the strategy document dated August 30, 1980, which was for ministers' eyes only, which became public. It referred to a strategy relative to the United Kingdom Parliament and made no mention of such a possibility.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier on the same issue. Is it the position of the government of Alberta that any attempt by the government of Canada to cut the ties with the Commonwealth of Nations would be resisted by every means possible by this government and the people of western Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I certainly can give the Leader of the Opposition the fullest and most complete assurance with regard to that, and say by way of brief elaboration that in this province and its capital city two years ago at the Commonwealth Games we saw the feelings of our citizens with regard to the Commonwealth, both as a concept and in terms of the peoples.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one further supplementary question to the Premier. In light of this matter being raised — a matter I certainly deem to be important — is it the intention of the Premier or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to contact the appropriate officials in Ottawa to get a definitive denial, I would hope, from the federal government, and to ascertain through Alberta House in London, as closely as it can, that in fact no pressure of that nature has been put on members of the British select committee?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, it is my understanding that the federal government has denied they have made such a threat to the British government or Parliament. Our follow-up will be first to confirm that denial; second, to communicate to our Agent General in London through the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs; third, in following up on the ministerial statement made today by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, to assure in whatever ways we can, in the process of making a representation to the British parliamentary committee on this particular matter, that they're aware of the feelings of the people of this province: very supportive of the concept of the Commonwealth.

St. Michael's Hospital

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It flows from the matter my colleague from Little Bow raised yesterday with regard to the petition and St. Michael's hospital in Lethbridge. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly today that as a result of the petition from some 18,000 people in Lethbridge and surrounding area the government is prepared to reconsider its decision of some 10 months ago regarding the future of St. Michael's?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in our view the question of St. Michael's is not under debate. We're committed to seeing it maintained as a good viable active treatment general hospital. We've continually said that. What is under debate and review at the present time is the extent of programs and the classification of beds that would be contained in the hospital. As I indicated in my response yesterday, we've been waiting since last July for the suggestion to come from the St. Michael's board.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the definition of active treatment hospital. Does the minister consider the services of obstetrics and pediatrics part of that active treatment hospital? Is there a clear definition of government at this time as to what an active treatment hospital is, or is it flexible — determined by the minister and his officials?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, by its very nature that is a flexible definition. If we look at active hospitals in different communities throughout the province, we'll see that.

In the case of Lethbridge, the difficulty in response to trying to meet concerns from all points of view is to develop a regional health centre that would serve the southern region of the province, which would contain a variety of specialized care services and, at the same time, still attempt to provide a satisfactory or acceptable level of active treatment in the second hospital in the same community.

With respect to the two programs the hon. member referred to, the recommendation of department officials was that obstetrics and pediatrics should not be contained in St. Michael's hospital. We have since indicated to the St. Michael's board that perhaps it would be possible to maintain some first-level obstetrical beds in the hospital, and that they should indicate to us how they would propose to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Last February the minister, through his deputy minister, indicated to the hospital board that before a proposal is accepted by the department, the board should first recognize and accept the revised scope of renovation, and that there would be certain limitations. At this point in time, has the department changed that scope of renovations? Would the submission the minister is waiting for have more flexibility in its interpretation and scope?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. We indicated that we wanted to put new construction dollars into developing the regional hospital as an investment in health care facilities for the region, and that we would be prepared to supply renovation and upgrading dollars for St. Mi-

chael's. Therein lies the dilemma. I believe St. Michael's board would also like to add new construction to their program in order to maintain the level of beds they now have. To this date, we haven't seen an argument presented from them that would cause us to change our minds.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicates he would be open to some kind of argument and presentations with regard to new construction. Could he elaborate on that and indicate what types of things he or his department would look for with regard to new construction?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it quite clear that we're not prepared to consider new construction for St. Michael's hospital, based on any argument or presentation put to us to this date. We are prepared to consider a change in the suggested program with respect to the renovations and classes of beds that would be contained in the reconstructed hospital. I say that with the caveat that unless there is some brand-new information or presentation I haven't seen yet, I believe our decision to restrict the program to renovation is the right one.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister indicate whether he has made a visit to St. Michael's hospital or plans to do so in the near future?

MR. RUSSELL: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I would go to the hospital if I were invited. I haven't been in either of the Lethbridge hospitals, although I've met with both boards on several occasions, both separately and jointly. I believe that was a case of circumstance, where the boards in fact preferred to meet on so-called third, neutral ground. But no, I haven't been in either hospital.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. With regard to other hospitals in southern Alberta, such as Taber — they're receiving a new unit — Vulcan, and one or two others, could the minister indicate to me whether the same types of parameters are being used in initiating the construction of those hospitals? I understand there are not to be pediatric or obstetric facilities. Is this a common, new policy by government in the building of new rural hospitals, because of the central facility being built in Lethbridge?

MR. RUSSELL: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member has inquiries about any specific hospital, I'd be pleased to take that as notice and bring back information as to what programs are involved, because they vary from community to community.

The difficulty in the case of Lethbridge is that in attempting to upgrade health care facilities for the whole region, we're attempting to develop some long-range planning for a regional health care referral centre. There's a limit to the extent to which programs for that kind of facility can be diluted by placing them in another facility or by duplicating them. We've attempted to reach some kind of compromise between the two hospital boards but obviously, from public comment, I think it's well known that many people are still unhappy with that compromise.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. The position of the government at the

present time and the position the government is holding with regard to St. Michael's is based on what in southern Alberta is called the Beckley document. I wonder if the minister could confirm that that is still the basis from which the minister is making his policy decision, and is the guideline being held by the department at this time in their discussions.

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. That so-called Beckley document is one of the pieces of information that went into our decision-making process. Any of the things in it are of course open to question or debate, and I've tried to make that quite clear. It's an internal, departmental working paper that I made available, in confidence, to the board of St. Michael's hospital to assist them in assessing some of the reasoning behind our decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway signaled that he had a supplementary.

DR. PAPROSKI: No, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Crop Insurance

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Agriculture is in regard to the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation. Is the policy of the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance to allow a discount of 5 per cent on any account paid in full before a certain deadline, in this instance July 15?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the all-risk crop insurance program in the province allows those farmers who take out application and cover themselves against loss the opportunity of a 5 per cent discount, if that amount is paid prior to August 15. That has existed for some time. It's a program that allows those in production in this province to avail themselves of coverage and, once the crop is in, an opportunity to establish the opportunity of that period before final payment has to be made, and of course recognized as a discount of 5 per cent.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If what the minister says is true — and I'm sure it is — could the minister inform the Assembly why, in at least one or more cases in my constituency, the discount has not been allowed when the bill has been paid in full before the deadline?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that if a farmer takes out coverage under the all-risk crop insurance and makes a claim prior to discount date, the amount of the coverage the individual would receive because of damage shows as a credit to the account and is credited against the total amount of coverage. At the time of discount, the discount would of course only apply to the balance.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister telling the Assembly that a farmer who pays his account by cheque one day before the deadline is allowed the discount, but if he pays in instalments on, say, July 1 or the end of July and the final payment before the deadline, he is not allowed the discount?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker. The farmer who makes the payment prior to the discount date is allowed

the full 5 per cent discount if he has no claim, the only differential being that if a claim is filed prior to discount date by an individual farmer, the discount only applies to the differential between the amount that one would be covered by the insurance and the total amount of coverage.

Edmonton Annexation Application

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs has to do with the Edmonton annexation application. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly if the Local Authorities Board has completed its report on the Edmonton annexation application?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on October 22 and again yesterday the hon. Member for St. Albert asked me questions of that nature, and I replied to them. Yesterday I informed the House again that it was my hope that that report would be completed and that I would be in a position to make it public prior to the end of this calendar year, which is only a matter of about five weeks. It's still the aim that the report would be public information by the end of the year.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I appreciate that answer from the minister, and I wanted him to verify the statement he made earlier. Can the minister indicate how soon a decision will be made by cabinet as to the recommendations in that report?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. It depends entirely on the nature of the recommendations. As members know, there are some very extensive implications with respect to the expansion and deciding on boundaries. I wouldn't like to put any time frame on the cabinet's deliberation of that report.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, did the minister indicate that the report would be made public before any recommendations come forth from the cabinet?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On several occasions I said in this House that it was my intention to make the recommendations of the Local Authorities Board panel, chaired by Mr. Justice Milvain, a matter of public record. That is usually not the case with respect to annexation hearings and the report provided to the Executive Council by the Local Authorities Board. In this case I said last fall and again last spring that it would be provided. There's been no change in that decision, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that the Premier has made a commitment in this Assembly and to me in writing that no decision will be made by cabinet before we have a debate in the Legislature, can the minister indicate at this time if that opportunity for debate will take place in the spring sitting of the Legislature?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to be advised as well of the correspondence between the Premier and the hon. member. The facts of the matter are that the manner in which the hon. member put it was not the exact contents of the information he received.

A commitment was made that this Legislature would have an opportunity to debate the matter of the annexation application by the city of Edmonton. That opportu-

nity has been provided on two occasions thus far, Mr. Speaker, and there is a good possibility that it would be provided on other occasions. In addition, I indicated to the hon. member during the spring session that I would be pleased if he might address the matter by way of a motion to the Assembly that might be debated on private members' day as well.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister trying to tell this Assembly that we are going to have a debate in this Assembly before the report has been completed? Is the minister trying to tell the people of Alberta that? [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: Really. Before the report.

DR. BUCK: Isn't that something.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I am only repeating what I've said on several other occasions in this Legislature with respect to the opportunities that arose. The first opportunity that arose to debate the matter, which then wasn't even a matter of public record in terms of the application put forward by the city of Edmonton, was when amendments were made to The Local Authorities Board Act with respect to the manner in which this issue would be decided. Surely the hon. member, not having taken advantage of those opportunities, is not anxious to suggest that another opportunity be provided now. I can only say the hon. member knows very well the rules of the House. My view is that the commitment made has without any question been lived up to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unbelievable.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister prepared to give this House the assurance that a government motion — let's not kid ourselves, talking about private members' day where we've got two hours — will be formally put before this Legislature so we can discuss the annexation question on the basis of the hearings that have taken place and the report that will be completed, after the report is obtained?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to give that assurance.

Earthquake Assistance

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer relates to the tragic earthquake a few days ago in Italy. In light of financial commitments that have already been made by both the federal government and the government of the province of Ontario, can the Provincial Treasurer advise whether or not the Alberta government will be providing financial assistance to help the survivors of this disaster?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we're considering that very unfortunate event right now. We'll be looking at the precedents in this province and making an appropriate announcement, if that's proper, within a matter of days.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the course of arriving at a decision, could the minister advise whether he is willing to give consideration to both an outright grant and a matching grant, whereby this government would match dollar for dollar funds

raised by volunteer groups throughout the province for this very purpose?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, all the options are reviewed. Of course the program we're in, in international aid, the good work and moneys raised by volunteer groups are matched now, would be one aspect which we would consider.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary. In light of the immediacy of the need for funds, can the minister give some indication to this House as to when a decision will be arrived at in this matter?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply in the absence of my colleague the Minister of Culture. As of today I am advised that the Italian community is preparing an application. On behalf of the government of Alberta, I have assured them that I would be recommending to the Executive Council to match the funds dollar for dollar, as the Provincial Treasurer indicated. The representation made by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn is an additional one which could be given consideration, but at this time I am not in a position to respond.

Television Reception

MR. STROMBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inquire if the Associate Minister of Utilities and Telephones has an open-sky policy in regard to the number of communities in Alberta buying satellite dishes or earth stations and tuning them in to receive signals from American stations. In light of the federal government ordering these dishes shut down, would the minister advise the House on the government's view of this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that his very enticing invitation is a request for an opinion rather than seeking facts, which is the purpose of the question period.

MR. STROMBERG: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I should have said: has the minister a policy on this matter?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I assume the open-sky policy the hon. member refers to is the policy some individual provinces have taken, that anyone with an earth station should be allowed to receive any signals that are in the sky. Some people have taken this position, as I have said. They have installed earth stations and, in some cases, the sky is now falling in. The federal government has in fact shut some of them down and warned others, particularly those who have earth stations or dishes on top of apartment blocks or hotels and are providing television services to the people in the apartments or hotels. In the case of the Holiday Inn in Winnipeg, it is my understanding that they are now taking court action with regard to the federal government move.

We as a government haven't adopted a policy yet, but it is my view that it is not clear that the federal government has jurisdiction even to licence these earth stations. They certainly have jurisdiction relative to the Radio Act and the Broadcasting Act, but in my view these stations are not broadcast-receive undertakings and therefore are not under federal jurisdiction. But at the moment we don't have a policy.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister undertaken any specific action to improve television service, beyond meeting with the broadcasters?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we have talked to the broadcasters in Alberta and indicated our great concern, as has the Northern Development Council, about the lack of television services in northern and rural communities. We would like to see better television service for these communities, but we also think that more Canadian programming should be put on Canadian satellites and made available to these people, rather than action being taken to shut down these earth stations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, a proposal involving an Alberta broadcaster has gone to the CRTC to provide a four-channel service on the Canadian satellite to northern and rural communities. We certainly support that particular proposal. We also support the proposals by other broadcasters and cable operators in Alberta, such as CFRN, who want to provide additional services via the terrestrial or microwave system.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, will the minister be following up on this matter with his counterparts in other provinces in the near future?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Provincial ministers are meeting tomorrow in Vancouver, and this will be one of the items on the agenda.

MR. STROMBERG: My second last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister made his views known to the federal government?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact it was on the agenda a year ago at the last federal/provincial communication ministers' conference. At that time the federal minister indicated they would be having public hearings on the provision of these services to remote northern communities, as well as pay TV, but they would come back and talk to the provinces before calling for licensing. The current federal minister has decided not to do that, however, and in fact has decided not to attend our meeting tomorrow.

MR. STROMBERG: My last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister be setting up an earth station on the grounds of the Legislature, such as was installed on the B.C. Legislature grounds in Victoria?

DR. WEBBER: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ANDERSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate to Albertans when we'll be able to have pay TV and what kind of schedule he's looking at in that regard?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of what is called the Thierien committee, that was looking at television services in remote northern communities as well as pay TV, indicated that they thought this country should be providing television services to remote northern communities before they get involved in a pay system for the more densely populated areas. It's my personal view that entrepreneurs in our province should be allowed to proceed in the way they wish to provide this program-

ming. I think it would certainly be an asset to the film industry in Alberta if that were to happen.

MR. L. CLARK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the Assembly if any thought has been given in his department to licensing some of these ground receivers so that in rural areas across Alberta — not just in northern areas, but in some of the smaller areas where cable is not feasible — there would be some way of getting better service in some of the smaller towns and villages across Alberta?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, certainly we have thought about that particular possibility. However, with a new series of satellites coming up in the next few years and the capabilities they have, the earth stations that would be required to receive the signals will be relatively cheap compared to the ones now. So I think there will be a proliferation of these in the future, and I think it will be a good thing that they proliferate and provide services to the communities the hon. member refers to. My personal view is that there shouldn't be any licensing of these stations.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received representation from theatre owners in the province with regard to the effect of pay TV on theatre operations and revenues?

DR. WEBBER: Not that I recall, Mr. Speaker. However, if these stations become numerous, I can certainly see the day down the road when it could have an impact on the theatre industry, particularly in smaller centres.

MR. BRADLEY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. minister consider receiving representations from theatre operators prior to making a firm policy on the question of pay TV?

DR. WEBBER: Most certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Rabies Control

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the presence of rabid animals in the province of Alberta is on the increase?

DR. BUCK: Rabies.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's a problem one should handle at a distance.

The rabies program, tied basically to the movement of skunks within the province of Alberta, early this spring reached a proportion sufficient to cause some concern in the direction one should take with predator control in southern Alberta. In 1976 the skunk population in southern Alberta had shown an increase and had reached a peak compared to skunk populations in that particular part of the province over a period of about 10 years.

We're very fortunate in this province that the rat patrol gives us the opportunity ... [laughter] The rat patrol, predator control, along the Saskatchewan border [with] the province of Alberta gives us a relatively rat-free province. But at the same time it gives us the opportunity to monitor other predators and so-called skunks. [laughter] Mr. Speaker, basically the skunks came from the southeastern part of Saskatchewan and Montana. Some

of them didn't get back. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, on examining the carcasses of many skunks in the area, it became apparent that rabies was a factor. The program was stepped up from the predator control point of view, involved with the municipalities and with the predator control officers who operate in the rat area of the province of Alberta. At the present time, it would appear that the skunk population is back close to normal. I might add that the numbers had never accelerated in the northern part along the border between Saskatchewan and Alberta, but showed up mainly in the southern part of the province.

Rabies is not a factor at the present time. It has been watched closely, and because skunks are the greatest carrier, we will continue to monitor the skunks, as we have, tied with the wildlife people and the night-light counts, which give us the opportunity to carry out some system of control in regard to the movement of skunks even after dark. So rabies in this province is under control at the present time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister considered putting a bounty on the smelly little creatures, so we can try to eliminate them coming into the province? [interjection]

MR. SCHMIDT: I like the answer of the Minister of Environment better, Mr. Speaker. I don't think control of skunks has reached the stage where a bounty is necessary, and we're having trouble finding a lot of trappers.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I notice the advertisement under Energy and Natural Resources for a wildlife biologist. Has this biologist been made necessary by an increase in rabid animals in Alberta?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. The problem wildlife officers are active in controlling and working with the people who look after control of rats, but the biologist isn't specifically for this purpose.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question ...

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize; I guess I was lost in the multitude of skunks. I overlooked the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

Constitution — Provincial Representation

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's a very difficult act to follow, incidentally, from the Minister of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, I was wondering — I know he didn't refer to anybody from the Ottawa government when he said "skunks".

DR. BUCK: That's very Canadian, Ken. Very Canadian.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, regarding his ministerial statement today and the comment that Alberta will be making representation to Britain and to individual MPs regarding our position. I just wanted clarification whether representation will also be made to individual members of the Senate.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that was an oversight on my behalf. We will be making representation to Canadian senators.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In spite of the fact that a select committee of the Legislature will be touring the country, I wonder if the minister would also indicate to the House whether a similar type of representation will be made to individual elected members of the provincial legislatures?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, while we haven't had a debate on the resolution to form a special committee, I would suggest that when that is considered by the Assembly — perhaps some time later today, or tomorrow — those would be some of the guidelines at the heart and the reason for the legislative committee to travel. I'm sure that as a result of debate we had here just recently with respect to Resolution 24, they have a very good point of reference to expand the communication across Canada.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated in his statement that he felt the decision had been predetermined and the joint House of Commons and Senate committee of the Ottawa government would have little or no impact on the final decision. Can the minister identify the facts or information which led him to this conclusion?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just note the most current one, which led us to that conclusion very recently. As hon. members are well aware, there is a particular section in the resolution before the Canadian Parliament which speaks to the language of education. I won't go into the pros and cons of the section with respect to language of education, except to point out that that section indicates that the first language learned should be the language in which you have the opportunity to be educated, no matter where you reside in Canada; that is, if my children learn English in Alberta and I move to Quebec, as it's now drafted they would have the right to go to school in English. Of course that is directly contrary to the current Bill 101 passed by the Quebec government.

I've just received a wire service copy that the Minister of Justice has announced a reversal on that policy, indicating that in the case of Quebec all people moving to Quebec would be forced to educate their children in French. I think that is one of the examples which indicates to us that the frame of reference is continuing to be changed. I could go on to indicate that Mr. Chretien has also indicated that he has a second amending process in mind, or other amending changes to the resolution, but he hasn't taken the time to present those to the committee at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this: it's very difficult for any government to make representation to that committee, not knowing exactly what the terms of reference are and in fact finding that the resolution itself is being changed in front of that committee. All in all, those are at least two of the points which have drawn us to the conclusion that the results of the committee have been predetermined.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary. In light of the majority of provinces opposing the approach the federal government is taking in constitutional amendment, has there

been any direct communication from the Ottawa government to the minister indicating a willingness to resume negotiations at the ministerial level?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my recollection right now, no.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It was obvious last night during West-Fed's presentation to the joint committee that they are sitting in isolation in Ottawa and that some members do not understand the problems, feelings, or aspirations of western Canada. If there is a possibility that the committee has validity and credibility and is not merely an exercise in futility, as it appears, has the minister made any representation or does he intend to make representation to his counterpart in Ottawa that the joint committee travel to Alberta and other parts of Canada in order to find out what the rest of Canada is really thinking?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, without attempting to put words in the hon. member's mouth, I'm sure she means the Canada West Foundation which, I recall, made a presentation last night to the standing joint committee. I'll assume that's the case.

With respect to the point itself, I think I indicated in this House some time ago that I was writing to Mr. Chretien to express our concerns with respect to the mechanism of the committee. That has been communicated to him in both written and verbal form. He knows our position full well with respect to the guidelines of the joint committee.

I agree with the Member for Drayton Valley that in fact the federal House could take a lesson from us. They should be able to put in motion, similar to what we have done, a committee which would travel across Canada to communicate and listen to the views of all Canadians. But unfortunately the federal government has been inflexible on that particular point and has not granted us that request.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Prior to making the decision not to appear before the special joint committee as Alberta, were there consultations with the other provinces, the six in particular? Are those provinces going to take the same position as Alberta has taken today?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been in consultation with the majority of the provinces that have differed with the federal government's position on the constitution. As recently as this morning, we have been in contact.

I think it's fair to indicate that two other provinces, Quebec and Newfoundland, will not be making presentations to the joint House/Senate committee of Canada. Their reasons are essentially those which I've outlined in the ministerial statement and in the questions this afternoon.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the hon. minister's answer on this very important point by emphasizing that the basic overriding decision of the government of Alberta on this point arises from our view that, first of all, has been long standing since we came to office in 1971: we believe that in a federal state our relationships with the federal government are on a government-to-government basis. With

only one or two very minor exceptions, we have maintained that position throughout.

In this particular case, it is the view of the government that the fundamental question here is that the federal Parliament believes it can act without the consent of the provinces. They're holding a parliamentary committee to determine how they do this, and the details of that. It is our view that if a provincial government that objects to that very process goes before that parliamentary committee and presents itself as a supplicant to that parliamentary committee, they in fact have contradicted their very basic position of saying the process itself is wrong.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a supplementary question to the hon. minister, with respect to the representation to the British select committee. What consultation has there been with other provinces on that particular matter? Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether Alberta will be one province acting alone or whether there be other provinces? Is it the intention of the government to make a representation with other provinces?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can specifically say that there has been consultation with other provinces with respect to the attitude or strategy with respect to presenting the constitutional position to the United Kingdom Parliament, either directly or through the special House committee. I would not want to abridge any confidences and announce here what I know in terms of their strategies, but I can say that more than one province will be making a representation. In the next day or so, as the deadline for petitions to the United Kingdom House is completed, which is this Friday or Saturday, I think that will be available by public information. But I can specifically say that more than one province is intending to make a representation to the United Kingdom Parliament.

While I'm on that point, Mr. Speaker, I should just indicate that we can't be more specific today as to whether we will be making an appearance before that committee, simply because they have to decide between December 3 and 10 whether they will be receiving representation from the provinces. I can't indicate anything more specific or more detail on how we will proceed, except to say that we'll be making a representation to the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: We have exceeded the time for the question period. However, I did mention the hon. members for Spirit River-Fairview and Edmonton Whitemud. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we could deal briefly with their questions.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the question I had will take a little longer, so I will put it tomorrow.

Hog Industry

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short question, again to the Minister of Agriculture. It seems to be his day for seeing if he has all the answers.

It's related to the hog stop-loss program implemented this spring. I know the minister had a particular objective in mind, which was not to allow the Alberta industry to shrink in relation to the Canadian industry. I'm wonder-

ing if the minister has any information which would indicate that the hog industry has not shrunk in relation to the Canadian industry, and whether it in fact has expanded as a proportion of the Canadian industry.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the last information I have, as of the latter part of October, shows about 10 per cent more hogs on farms than existed a year ago, which gives us an indication that the industry itself certainly had sufficient faith and kept up the numbers of feeders.

But a number that perhaps ties more closely to the stop-loss program and its success shows an increase of 4 per cent in farrowings at this time, which would be a direct representation and an indication of decisions made at the time of the stop-loss announcement and the subsequent breeding carried on because of that program.

So the indications we have at the present time are that the stop-loss program achieved infusion of needed dollars to an industry at a particular time, and through that infusion of dollars gave the indication for the long term. Those numbers indicate that the hog industry in this province is running at a normal pace.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

17. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the *Standing Orders* of the Legislative Assembly be amended as follows:

Standing Order 79 is amended by striking out "as set out in the Second Schedule to The Companies Act [R.S.A. 1970]" and substituting "pursuant to The Companies Act,".

MR. CRAWFORD: A brief word of explanation, perhaps, although I think it's apparent from the wording of the motion what the situation must be. It's simply that the Second Schedule to The Companies Act, 1970, referred to was the correct reference prior to certain amendments having been made to The Companies Act. Because of the amendments which resulted in the withdrawal of Schedule 2, an appropriate reference would now be to say simply "pursuant to The Companies Act".

[Motion carried]

18. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the Assembly receive the report of the Select Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act relating to the 1978-79 fiscal year, presented by Mr. Payne, Chairman, on Monday, November 5, 1979, and concur in the following recommendation as outlined on page 18 of the report:

D. PROCEDURAL

1. That in light of indications by the Executive Council that necessary funding will be approved, the committee implement its 1978 recommendation concerning the hiring of consultants on a project basis.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund select standing committee has been in members' hands for some time. One of the aspects of the report seemed important earlier in the year. In order that it could be acted upon by the committee, because it involved the hiring of consultants

which would include an expenditure, it seemed important that that item be agreed to at as early a date as possible. So without reference to whatever other steps might be taken or have been taken in respect of the report, I suggest that this should be given the separate attention disclosed by the motion and passed.

[Motion carried]

25. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the *Standing Orders* of the Legislative Assembly be amended as follows:

- (1) Standing order 46(1)(g) amended by striking out "the Offices of the Auditor General and the Ombudsman" and substituting "Legislative Offices";
- (2) Standing Order 46.1(1) amended by striking out "the Offices of the Auditor General and Ombudsman" and substituting "Legislative Offices".

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, once again the motion is relative to amendment to *Standing Orders*. If hon. members direct their attention to the changes in The Election Act before the House, I would simply point out that it is intended that the Chief Electoral Officer also have access to the committee which in the past has been known as the committee on the Ombudsman and the Auditor General. In order to have a name which suits all three of those officers, the suggestion is that *Standing Orders* be amended by changing the name from what it is now to committee on Legislative Offices.

[Motion carried]

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

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 89

The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 89, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 88

The Election Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendments to Bill 88 have been circulated. Are there any question or comments regarding the amendments?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I would like to make a couple of comments on Bill No. 88, The Election Act, 1980. Very briefly, I would like to compliment the sponsor of the Bill, the good member Dr. Reid. I recognize the hard work and the long and arduous hours put in by the member and other members of the Progressive Conservative caucus in putting together this Bill in nine parts, logical groupings of the different divisions. I just think it's a tremendous piece of work. I did have the opportunity of sitting many hours with them myself, and appreciated their full participation and discussion on it.

Several parts of the Bill deserve particular comment. I think one is the opportunity for absentee voters to vote under the proposed Bill. That is something they did not have before. I think the Bill recognizes the mobility of our work force, the fact that a lot of people who live in one centre may work throughout the province on a moving basis. They may be here six weeks, six months; somewhere else at a later period. I think it's important to give them the opportunity of voting in the residential area, the constituency in which they live.

The Bill would also affect student voters, people in hospitals, and indeed people on winter vacations. With the propensity of Albertans — I guess North Americans generally — toward winter vacations, I think the accommodation provided them in the Bill is important.

I think another section that is particularly apt is the penalty section, where the committee grouped what might be described as less serious offences in one penalty section, and took those that go to the heart of the democratic process, which could perhaps be better defined as corrupt practises — much more serious offences — and logically grouped them together in a second part.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to comment that the Chief Electoral Officer, selected by a legislative committee of this Assembly some three or four years back, Mr. Wark, has done a superb job in administering the last election and assisting members in the proposed revisions to this Bill.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to comment on the comments of opposition members last week about the shortage of time within which we had to read the Bill. I've gone through the Bill, and you can read it fully, as some other member commented, in two hours quite handily. That is a very, very serious study of the Bill. I would observe that there aren't people in Alberta who should be better versed on the election process than the people in this Assembly. Presumably they are in reasonable contact with their returning officers and other workers in the field. So there is, and has been, a continuing opportunity for input to the Bill by all members of this House.

I would urge the support of all members for this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member gets up and makes that speech again. I've said in this House many, many times since the Conservative government took over that if you think you know more than the people, one of these days the people will give you the answer. We sit here as a privilege. We have no right at all to sit here unless the people give us that privilege. For an hon. member to say that we have all the answers and we don't have to go back and check with constituents, returning officers, and a lot of other people, is a lot of nonsense. I know the hon. member has walked into this trap. He keeps making the assumption that he came to this Legislature with all the answers and doesn't have to

go back and report to the people in Calgary. In one of these elections I hope the hon. member finds out who speaks in this Legislature. It's the people of Alberta. I hope that's who I speak for. If I ever lose that sensitivity, I hope the people dispose of me accordingly and send me back to wherever, because I do not deserve to be here.

I only use The Election Act as a symbol of the approach of this government in many situations just like this. If as a government they want to become that insular and naive government about public feelings and attitudes, carry on, because we want to be the government of this province. One of these days we will be the government, not because the people come out to support us, but because they throw out the Conservatives because they know they're not worth even sitting in the House as representatives. That will happen. Let's not forget that. This is just a symbol of an attitude that really irks me when I sit in this Legislature.

Certainly amendments are needed. Certainly I can read The Election Act in two hours. But that's only my appraisal. Maybe my appraisal won't come up with anything after two hours. But maybe there are some very informed people in my constituency who would like to spend two hours and give me one hour of recommendations. I think we haven't had the opportunity to do that. Maybe they won't give me any recommendations, but they have studied the Act, given me their approval and said, go to the Legislature, accept it, vote on it, because we will be part of the changes in that Act.

Mr. Chairman, at this point it hasn't happened. On that basis I just don't feel excited about passing or even getting involved in this Act at this time. Maybe it's good legislation, but the process we're being put through and the demand on us at present are unfair and bad.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I was not too upset about this Bill until the Minister of Government Services got up and gave me one of his holier-than-thou speeches. I endorse what my hon. colleague Mr. R. Speaker had to say. In an area as politically sensitive as this, there should not appear to be any political bias whatsoever in this type of legislation, especially this Bill. Many people, probably much smarter and much more intelligent than we are in this Assembly, may have some very, very good ideas about some of the amendments to The Election Act. All the wisdom does not rest in the Tory caucus, in spite of what the hon. Minister of Government Services tries to indicate.

This Bill does not have to proceed at this time. I've tried to indicate to the Government House Leader: if you want to keep the people who feel they have some opportunity to participate in the democratic process, leave the Bill until the spring. The enumeration is not going to be done until next September. That's the way the Act reads now. There's absolutely no hurry at all for this Bill. I can understand when we were debating the architects Bill yesterday. This has been going on for years. I see the hon. member from Hinton is ready to leap to his feet. We have an Act in place. There's not going to be an election, unless the government wants to call a snap election to try to get rid of the five opposition members here now. I know they need a bigger mandate. We listen to that from the Premier all the time: they need a bigger mandate. I don't know how much bigger you need it.

Seriously, Mr. Minister, this Act does not have to proceed now. Give the people of the province an opportunity to participate. All the wisdom is not in your caucus. Then bring the thing back in the spring. You've

given the people the opportunity. I'm sure they will give you some very, very positive, constructive suggestions.

So I say to the hon. minister, hold the Bill. Don't think you have all the wisdom. Let the people of the province participate, because the issue is not that pressing.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some comments in response to the hon. members opposite. The Bill was introduced on November 18, which is admittedly quite close to the end of this session. The second reading debate commenced only two days later. At the commencement of that debate I made some remarks on the Act. I felt I indicated that it had been put together taking into consideration suggestions or problems brought to our attention by candidates, voters, campaign workers and, through the Chief Electoral Officer, by the various election officers in the 1979 election.

I have checked with the Chief Electoral Officer on this. He assures me that out of the 79 returning officers, for instance, in excess of 65 contributed input to the advice and recommendations he made to the committee. The Chief Electoral Officer was involved throughout. In addition, he brought the recommendations from what is referred to as the *ad hoc* committee of the registered political parties. That committee has representatives of the four registered political parties in the 1979 election. The submissions of those representatives to that committee were also involved in his input.

In other words, the input to the committee did take into consideration problems that had occurred in the 1979 election. In many instances, the Bill represents the answer to those problems. There was a completely open input by election officials, candidates, or voters who had problems.

It was interesting in the debate on second reading that there was one compliment from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to do with changes in the enumeration process. One of the reasons for bringing the Bill forward at this time and aiming to have it passed at this sitting of the Legislature, is so that the Chief Electoral Officer will have the new Bill in finished form, completed and passed, so that he can get on with making arrangements for the 1981 enumeration. There are significant changes in the enumeration process. They require a lot of preparatory work by the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff, and he requested that the Bill go ahead at this time to enable him to carry out the enumeration under the new Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding Bill 88 as amended?

MR. GOGO: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I commend the Member for Edson for doing an excellent job on what I think is a major job, an election Act, that affects not only those in the House but all those who hope to come into the House.

I'd like to point out two questions to the member. They're on pages 64 and 65 of the xerox copy of the Bill, sections 129 and 130. With reference to the Broadcasting Act of Canada, about advertising on polling day and on the day preceding polling day, I'm just a little confused. Perhaps he could help me with regard to the difference,

under the Broadcasting Act, between electronic media versus daily papers; in other words, if an ad is put in a daily paper, can it come out on polling day? If he wouldn't mind responding either now or later.

Section 130: with the passing of our Bill 75, The Liquor Control Act, I thought we had sort of come to our senses a little with regard to booze. I see, hon. member, that it's back there: we don't allow anybody even a sniff of anything towards alcoholic beverage during polling day. Mr. Chairman, was there much representation to the member with regard to Section 130, either the opening of premises or the selling of alcohol on polling day?

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the questions asked by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, the prohibition on partisan political broadcasting by the electronic media on polling day and the day preceding was really introduced to bring the Act in line with what happens in actual fact. It was a gap in the old Act; it was a defect that it was not specified. Therefore the only satisfactory route was to go through the control mechanism of the CRTC.

It was felt that if it was put in the Act, and it was therefore quite obvious that that prohibition was there, that would draw the attention of people who were running as candidates and their campaign workers. It would also draw attention to the electronic media in advance, so they would be able to program any advertising that was paid for knowing it would be prohibited on those two dates.

The reason for limiting it to the electronic media is that that is the only instantaneous media we have. It would be extremely difficult to ban advertising in rural newspapers because, although they may officially come out on one day, they are often published the date ahead. The other thing, of course, is advertising in magazines that are on the racks for a whole week. It would be extremely difficult to word any prohibition on advertising in the print media on polling day.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member — and I presume his chairmanship of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission has something to do with his question about what he colloquially called booze on polling day. The prohibition is on commercial sale of alcoholic beverages during the time the polls are open. As soon as the polls are closed, the prohibition ceases. The only difficulty we had with relation to this were some suggestions that in by-elections in the major metropolitan areas, there is the difficulty that the purveyors of alcoholic beverages on one side of the street may be closed and the ones on the other side of the street may be open. There is not much way of getting around that except to ban the sale in the whole of the metropolitan area, and it was felt that's a bit unjustified in the case of a by-election.

DR. BUCK: I'd like to ask a question of the hon. member sponsoring the Bill. This has to do with a matter which was brought to my attention in the last election. Before I ask that question, I'd like to ask the hon. member sponsoring the Bill: were all the members of the Assembly polled on the proposed new Act?

Secondly, the matter I want to bring attention to is about advertising and when it must cease before polling date. As a practising politician I have always made sure that if my local newspaper was going to print on a Thursday, but was going to be delivered on Wednesday, which is polling day, my political advertising was not in that newspaper that day because I felt that contravenes

the Act. But I would like to bring to the hon. member's attention that I know this happened several times in the province in the last election. The ad was put in, say on a Thursday, and it appeared the day of the election. I'd just like to ask the minister if we now have safeguards in this legislation that that will not occur.

DR. REID: In answer to the question by the Member for Clover Bar on polling all the members of the Legislature — I presume he means requests for input. I'm sorry, I can't answer that question. I took over chairmanship of the committee a short time after it was formed, due to the illness of the original chairman. I am unable to answer 100 per cent for sure, and I would hate to give the member wrong information. There was a request for input, and I'm not 100 per cent sure to whom that request was addressed.

With regard to print advertising, there is no prohibition on print advertising because of the difficulties I mentioned. It is specifically not there because of the uncertainty of the date of delivery of, say, the weekly rural newspaper. Sometimes they are delivered on the evening of the previous day, but go on sale in the local drugstore or magazine rack on the polling date. For that reason, it was felt that rather than attempt to delineate a prohibition on printed advertising on that date, it was fairer to leave it open so that any candidate can put his advertising in on that date, rather than have a difference of opinion as to whether it was legal, and all the difficulties of the print media.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can clarify a little of this. I was the original chairman and was hospitalized. I know that notices were prepared. But I can't say whether they were delivered to all members of the Legislature, because I was incapacitated. I want to thank the hon. member for taking over the committee. Maybe it was a lucky thing for the committee, because he did such an admirable job; far better, I'm certain, than I could have done.

I don't know whether the notices were delivered, but notices were prepared to be sent out to all members. Whether they were delivered, I wasn't in a position to check for about a month afterwards.

Thank you.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. REID: I ask that Bill 88, The Election Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 90
The Architects Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some amendments to this Act. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding Bill No. 90 as amended?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 90 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 95
The Interpretation Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 95, The Interpretation Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 96
The Engineering and Related
Professions Amendment Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 96 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 97
The Police Amendment Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the Solicitor General, I move that Bill 97, The Police Amendment Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**
(Committee of the Whole)

Bill Pr. 1
The La Fondation de l'Association
Canadienne-Francaise de l'Alberta Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague who is absent from the House, I would move that the Bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill Pr. 4
The Keith Dial Adoption Termination Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Calgary McKnight, I move that Bill Pr. 4 be reported.

[Motion carried]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)
(continued)

Bill 93
The Workers' Compensation
Amendment Act, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding this Act?

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, during second reading of the Bill, unlike other members of the select committee I chose to remain silent. I had nothing to add to what they had already added. However, concerns have been expressed by various individuals and employers throughout Alberta, and most have been satisfied as a result of explanation as to the intent of the recommendations. Basically the concerns were a result of a lack of understanding or misinterpretation of the intent of the recommendations.

However, there is one point I would like the hon. minister to make comments on, at whatever length he sees fit. I wonder if the minister would please advise this committee why, in the case of the \$22,000 ceiling, the recommendation of the select committee was not put into effect; i.e., 90 per cent of the net income.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, that would have been part of the package of policies that would have involved other policies. For that reason the advisory committee to the minister on workers' compensation reviewed the possibilities and recommended to me — and I shared with them — the principle of continuation of the 75 per cent of gross for this amendment. The recommendation of the select committee of 90 per cent of net would have been part of the package, and I would sincerely hope that would be one of the changes of legislation that will come forward in the spring.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 93, The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1980, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister, I don't believe the requirement is needed to beg leave to sit again.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, a private Bill reported today by the hon. chairman of the Private Bills committee would yet require committee study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was suggesting we just move each time we go into committee, and we don't ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bills 89, 95, 96, 97, Pr. 1, Pr. 4, 93, and Bills 88 and 90 with some amendments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report by the Deputy Chairman of Committees, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to move to second reading of private Bill Pr. 7, the report on which was given today by the hon. chairman of the Private Bills committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the agreement unanimous?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**
(Second Reading)

Bill Pr. 7
The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act.

In addressing second reading of this Bill, I think it's fair to say that this Bill represents one of the finest examples of the prerogative available to the Legislature to do justice when that justice is only available from this, the highest jurisdiction in the province.

Very briefly, the circumstances involve a young man, Warren Dean Boyd, who at the age of approximately 6 months was brought into the home of the Marshall family and was raised as their son from that date forward. During the period of his infancy, to becoming an adult, there was never a formal adoption of Warren Dean Boyd, for a number of circumstances, not the least of which was the untimely death of Mr. Marshall in 1976, two years prior to Warren Dean Boyd attaining his majority.

The Child Welfare Act of the province of Alberta provides that, having attained the age of majority, one cannot in fact be adopted as the son of another. There was a very deep wish on the part of both Mrs. Marshall and Warren Dean Boyd, who is now approximately 20

years of age, to make Warren Dean Boyd the legal son of Mrs. Marshall and a true member of that family. On that basis they commenced the process of petitioning this Legislature for that relief.

The Private Bills committee of this Legislature gave consideration to the application; took into account the very difficult circumstances the family went through. The young man in question has suffered from muscular dystrophy from a very early age. The family has stood by his side and helped him, with government assistance, through these difficult years. Having taken into account all the circumstances and the very deep wish on the part of both Warren Dean Boyd and the Marshall family that he become a legal member of that family, the committee recommended to this Assembly that the Bill be proceeded with.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to move second reading of this private Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. No. 7 read a second time]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Third Reading)

Bill 33

**The Medical Services Research Foundation
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Mr. Isley, I move third reading of Bill No. 33.

[Motion carried; Bill 33 read a third time]

Bill 73

**The Public Inquiries
Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2)**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 73, The Public Inquiries Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 2).

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being here for second reading or committee stage of the Bill. I really have two concerns with respect to Bill 73 which I would ask the hon. member to address when he concludes his remarks.

Obviously when public inquiries are established a certain amount of power must be given. But as I look at the powers with respect to a commissioner on individuals, it would seem to me those powers are very extensive. Powers with respect to entering any building, obtaining documents, are very, very extensive powers; no question about that.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there seems to me to be some inconsistency. With respect to the government, there are all sorts of constraints. For example, I find that if the Attorney General certifies that . . . production of any document, paper or thing or the disclosure . . .

And then:

the deliberations . . . of the Lieutenant Governor in Council . . .
matters of a secret or confidential nature . . .
matters . . . cannot be made without prejudice to the interests of persons not [required] in the inquiry

And the Attorney General may in fact refuse information. Mr. Speaker, as I looked at the Bill I couldn't help but

sense that we were giving rather unusual and broad powers in dealing with the citizens, yet when it came to the government being compelled to supply information — we are dealing now with a properly constituted public inquiry — there were all kinds of escape hatches.

Subsequent to the introduction of the Bill and second reading, I've had an opportunity in the last few hours to share my concern with people in the civil-liberties field, and they've expressed a similar caveat about the ramifications of Bill 73.

So I would have to express those comments, Mr. Speaker, on third reading. I regret I wasn't able to raise them before, but I would ask the hon. member to respond to them when he concludes debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In responding to the concerns raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I don't know whether he has had an opportunity to read my remarks in *Hansard* on second reading of the Bill, but for his information I'm pleased to try as best I can to repeat them.

I think the first thing that has to be noted is the severe limitations of this particular amendment. Those limitations are first addressed in the definition of a public building. In fairness, it is not correct to suggest that the provisions of this Bill would enable a commissioner under a public inquiry to go into private residences. That's just not the case, and that was very specifically dealt with in the drafting of this legislation.

Public building is defined in Section 6(2)(b) of the Bill, in the first instance as "a facility as defined in *The Social Care Facilities Review Committee Act*"; secondly, "a hospital as defined in *The Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee Act*"; and thirdly, "any other building or part of a building where a Government funded service is carried on". That wording was chosen rather carefully to ensure that the concern the member raised would not become a reality; namely, that there not be some wide discretion to go into private residences. I think that's the first point that needs to be borne in mind.

However, the safeguards don't end there. If a commissioner involved with a public inquiry is of the opinion it is necessary to enter a so-defined public building for the purpose of obtaining documentations relevant to that public inquiry, he must in fact obtain an order of a judge. That order would not be granted to the commissioner unless the judge were satisfied on application that the documentation and access to the public building being sought were relevant to that particular public inquiry.

There are additional provisions with respect to having obtained custody of those documents, the fact that their confidentiality must be maintained, that either copies or originals be returned forthwith so as not to interfere with the normal conduct of the affairs of business carried on in that public building.

With respect to the concern about the non-disclosure of such documents, one has to review rather carefully the legislation. In the first instance it provides that the same privileges exist in relation to disclosure of information as exist in a normal court of law. The same rights of privilege that would exist in a court of law exist in respect of these procedures.

However, Section 8(2) of the Bill goes on to say that

essentially the right of Crown privilege, which is the right of the Crown to withhold disclosure of documents, is removed in the first instance, which is in fact quite a major step to ensure greater access by the public and the commissioner, in this instance, to documentations that are Crown related. However, having removed that right of Crown privilege, which is a long-standing right, as the member is undoubtedly aware, certain caveats are put upon it. So it is not a complete wiping out of the right of Crown privilege.

Those limitations are contained in Section 8(4) of the Bill and are limited strictly to "deliberations or proceedings of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Executive Council, or a committee of either of them"; secondly, "matters of a secret or confidential nature or matters the disclosure of which would not be in the public interest"; or thirdly, "matters the disclosure of which cannot be made without prejudice to the interests of persons not concerned in the inquiry".

I think it needs to be acknowledged that item 8(4)(b) does provide some range, but it was felt essential to provide some scope not to disclose documents that it would not be in the public interest to disclose, embodying it in this legislation. I hope that explanation is of some assistance.

I would try to summarize by saying, in the first instance, that the Bill is very strictly limited to public buildings as defined. Secondly, a court order would be required to establish that there are reasonable grounds for such access. Thirdly, the right of Crown privilege does not exist within the confines of the Bill, although there are some grounds upon which disclosure could be withheld of documents that it would not be in the public interest to disclose, and as further enumerated in Section 8(4).

Finally, I should point out for the benefit of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, as I mentioned in second reading, that this Bill is drafted more tightly, if I can use that expression, than comparable Ontario legislation, which is not limited to public buildings in the way this Bill has specifically been limited. Again, the reason for that limitation was to ensure there would not be access, there would be no intrusion on private rights.

Those are my comments in respect of this Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 73 read a third time]

Bill 74

The Planning Amendment Act, 1980

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I move third reading of Bill No. 74, The Planning Amendment Act, 1980.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking briefly to Bill No. 74, I want to review the principles contained in the Bill in light of some of the representation I've had in the last few days. I should point out that one of the concerns that has been brought to my attention, and to the attention of other members, I'm sure — and I believe the hon. Member for Lethbridge West made reference to it yesterday, as I reviewed *Hansard*. There was some real concern on the part of regional planning commissions as to the time frame in terms of dealing with this legislation. For example, it's my understanding that with respect at least to one of the planning commissions, they received the notice of the Bill the day after the deadline for sending in

their observations. As a consequence, we are once again getting into a situation not unlike The Election Act, The Architects Act, and other legislation where there hasn't been, in my view, the kind of input required.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with three other items contained in Bill 74. The first is this business of removing the obligation that members must be at public hearings before voting on a matter that has been before a public hearing. The concern that has been brought to my attention is that that really does open the door for private lobbying. It's a dangerous principle and one that even with the very best of intentions on the part of local officials — no one is questioning the motives of 99 per cent of the people involved in public office, at either level for that matter. But it seems to me the question is the principle of whether we should have people making decisions when they could not be present when there have been public hearings on a particular matter. As I reviewed *Hansard*, the minister indicated it wasn't possible because people are busy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there really isn't much point in having public hearings of one kind or another if members don't have to be there. Public hearings are an opportunity for the average person to make representation. We all know that certain groups are able to make the kind of representation on a much less informal but more consistent basis that strengthens their position in any event, but at least that's balanced if the individual who has to make the decision, the elected official, has been at a public hearing and has the benefit of the representation made at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the question of these sort of mini planning commissions within regional planning commissions has certainly caused some concern on the part of several planning commissions in the province. The suggestion has been made that in other jurisdictions that has caused difficulties. I could see where there may be some short-term advantages, and I can even see that in the planning commission in the area I happen to represent. But I can see the long-term problem of having joint committees, which in fact are mini planning commissions within regional planning commissions, causing a good deal of problem down the road.

Similarly another aspect of this legislation is the requirement that adjacent property holders are no longer going to be formally notified of their right of hearing. Instead, after a decision is made, I believe they have 15 days in order to be notified by the press. As one of the regional directors pointed out, there are a number of newspapers in this particular area. Which newspaper do you choose? How can you really be fair? What happens to the person who perhaps just misses that? The average individual doesn't really scrutinize all the local papers from start to finish and look at every notice contained in it. We've moved from a situation where the person who may be affected by subdivision, and now has an opportunity at least to make representation at the hearing, is in a situation where perhaps he or she has the information, perhaps not.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I look over the legislation it's obvious that once again we have increased the power of a provincial agency; this time the Provincial Planning Board. I really question how valuable that is. It seems to me that one of the advantages of regional planning commissions is that after all we bring together locally chosen people, in the case of our Peace River planning commission, from the city of Grande Prairie, the county, the MDs, the improvement districts. We have representa-

tion from every level of local government.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to members of this House that while I've not always agreed with decisions made by the Peace River planning commission, I would never argue for a moment that that planning commission isn't about as close to being representative of the Peace River block as any agency can be, because it's made up of people who are elected and chosen at the local level. It's not a commission that is dominated by the city of Grande Prairie. As a matter of fact, their representation is a very tiny part of the total representation. Having attended a number of meetings of the planning commission, seen the process by which the regional plan has been advanced, and the rigorous discussion, I frankly say — and I know members of this House may not share that point of view, or not all of it in any event — that from the observations I've been able to make of the Peace River planning commission, they are doing an excellent job. I say with a certain amount of trepidation that it concerns me to see what appears to be a shift of some authority from the regional level to the provincial level.

For those reasons, on third reading I'd just like to underline some of the concerns I have at this time and some of the specific objections that have been brought to my attention in the last several days.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
77	The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1980	Hyndman
78	The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Supplementary Act, 1980	Hyndman
82	The Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1980	Horsman (for Webber)
84	The Health Occupations Act	Bogle
92	The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1980 (No. 3)	Leitch
94	The Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 1980	Horsman (for Russell)

head: **PRIVATE BILLS** (Third Reading)

Bill Pr. 3 **The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill Pr. 3, The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1980.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 3 read a third time]

Bill Pr. 5

The Alberta Foundation Act

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, I would move third reading of Bill No. Pr. 5, The Alberta Foundation Act, as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the amendment extend to the title?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member wish to move the motion in the amended title? Is this the final version of the title?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: The final title of the Bill will be The Charitable Foundation of Alberta Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite right, and that doesn't come into effect until this Bill is passed.

[Motion carried, Bill Pr. 5 read a third time]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave of the Assembly to proceed with third reading of Bills dealt with earlier this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Third Reading) (continued)

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
88	The Election Act, 1980	Reid
89	The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1980	Horsman (for Crawford)
90	The Architects Act, 1980	Chambers
93	The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1980	Diachuk
95	The Interpretation Act, 1980	Wolstenholme
96	The Engineering and Related Professions Amendment Act, 1980	Chambers
97	The Police Amendment Act, 1980	Horsman (for Harle)

head: **PRIVATE BILLS** (Third Reading) (continued)

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
Pr. 1	The La Fondation de l'Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Alberta Act	Zaozirny (for Cook)
Pr. 4	The Keith Dial Adoption Termination Act	Zaozirny (for Musgreave)

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration Bill Pr. 7.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the Assembly to proceed into committee to deal with Bill Pr. 7, dealt with earlier today in second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the Assembly to proceed to third reading of Bill Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**
(Committee of the Whole)
(continued)

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

head: **PRIVATE BILLS**
(Third Reading)
(continued)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will please come to order for consideration of Bills on the Order Paper.

Bill Pr. 7
The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act

Bill Pr. 7
The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there questions or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Act?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I move third reading of Bill Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 7 read a third time]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow of course is private members' day. The afternoon will be taken with private members' business. Tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock it is proposed the House will deal with anything remaining on the Order Paper and, assuming that is done in sufficient time, proceed to Royal Assent to various Bills on the Order Paper.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I move that Bill Pr. 7, The Warren Dean Boyd Adoption Act, be reported.

Mr. Speaker, I move this House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 p.m.

[Motion carried]

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

[At 4:57 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]